



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# The Jewish Quarterly Review.

---

OCTOBER, 1893.

---

## THE READING OF THE LAW AND PROPHETS IN A TRIENNIAL CYCLE.

### II.

THE general result which follows with perfect certainty from the foregoing investigation<sup>1</sup> is that the custom of reading passages from the Pentateuch regularly was very gradually developed, and passed through various stages. Be it now our task to follow also the Haftaras from their origin to the last stage of their Palestinian development, for there can be no doubt that the present permanent form of the Haftara was also a gradual growth from small beginnings. We must point out at once that whilst tradition, with its assumption of three stages in the introduction of the Torah readings, has made it possible to find out the dates of their establishment, we have no such help in respect to the readings from the prophets. For neither the prophets nor Ezra have been represented as originators of this institution.<sup>2</sup> Its date, may, however, be approximately determined from

---

<sup>1</sup> See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V., p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> The Karaites (Neubauer, *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek*, p. 71) name Ezra as the author of the institution of the Haftaras. Yet since the ancient authorities make no mention of it, this account does not deserve any credit.

the following considerations. We found that the introduction of Pentateuchal week-day portions was ascribed to Ezra, and that the date of this institution was the first century of the common era. Now since the reading of the prophets is not ascribed to Ezra, it must have had a later origin, so that its earliest date is the latter part of the first century. This inference, in itself extremely weak, is considerably strengthened by the fact that the apostles (Luke iv. 7; Acts xiii. 15, 27) speak of a regular sabbatical prophet portion. This, however, betokens an advanced stage of the development; its origin must, therefore, be of much earlier date. Further, we see in the Mishna (*Meg.* iv.) the sages of the end of the first century discuss concerning the admissibility of reading some prophetical pieces in the synagogues. These portions had already been assigned to the various Sabbaths, so that we can here also infer that the reading from the prophets must have originated at latest in the first half of the first century. This can be still further demonstrated by the closer observation of the passages, some of which were not allowed to be read in public, others not to be translated. The Mishna (*Meg.* iv. 10) enumerates several Pentateuch passages, which, by way of exception to the rest of the Torah, were not expounded to the people after their recital, namely, Gen. xxxviii., Exod. xxxii. At the same time it mentions also sections from the prophets, which are particularly specified as portions not to be read, namely, 2 Sam. xiii., Ezek. i., were not to be read as Haftaras at all; R. Judah, however, allows it. R. Eliezer is of opinion that Ezek. xvi. should not be read as a Haftara. If we add to this the statement of the Tosefta, where (*Meg.* iv. 31) Gen. i., xix. 31-38, Judges xix., and 2 Sam. xvi. 21, are mentioned as texts which are to remain unexplained, whilst 2 Sam. xiii. is altogether excluded from the list of Haftaras (v. *B. Meg.* 25), it is manifestly clear that these sections whose translation was interdicted were adopted as Haftaras. We see also that several sections

which were prohibited to be read publicly by some authorities, were allowed by others. If we seek to discover those Pentateuch portions to which the above-mentioned prophetical pieces are appropriate, we see that Judges xix. 22-24 is almost a literal copy of Gen. xix. 4-8; Absalom's act, described in 2 Sam. xvi. 21 is similar to Reuben's in Gen. xxxv. 22; and also a resemblance between 2 Sam. xi. 5 and Gen. xxxviii. is noticeable. We notice now that just those Pentateuchal passages are suggested by virtue of their contents which were enumerated by the Tosefta; so that we have before us the Torah and prophet readings of several Sabbaths, both of which were not allowed to be translated. Besides the seven mentioned above, the Mishna names two other passages from Ezekiel which were prohibited to be read as Haftaras, namely, chaps. i. and xvi. The latter chapter has this in common with the others mentioned, that in this portion the lewdness of the Israelites in Egypt (equal to idolatry) is treated in a metaphor; in the others the unchastity of Reuben, Amnon, Absalom, and David is referred to as fact. The Talmud (*J. Megilla*, III. 10, and *B. Megilla*, 25b) gives us some idea as to why these passages should not be made accessible and intelligible to the common folk. It is narrated there that when R. Eliezer heard somebody translating Ez. xvi., he said to him, "Why do you pry after the abomination of Jerusalem; go, inquire first after your mother's shame." It was not deemed advisable to calumniate the past of their own ancestors, their own nation; they heard enough of this from other quarters outside their own Bible. It was for this reason also that Leviticus xx. was prohibited to be translated or explained in the synagogue.<sup>1</sup> This, however, could not have been the cause of the rejection of Ezek i., since this describes nothing except the revelation of God to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Chagiga*, II., 1. As we shall see, Ezek. xvi. was the Haftara of the Pentateuchal portion of Lev. xx.

Ezekiel. We can, however, gather from an ancient source (*B. Chagiya*, 13a) that this particular chapter very nearly brought about the exclusion of the entire book from the Canon. There were based on the description of the divine throne philosophical speculations concerning God and the Universe, which were calculated to divert the thoughts of the Jews into forbidden paths. On this account it was prohibited to read this chapter in public, so that the propagation of the doctrines which were derived from its contents should be retarded. It was the tendency towards Gnosticism which first began to make itself felt in Judaism in the first quarter of the second century.

R. Joshua was the contemporary and colleague of R. Eliezer, who disallowed the explanation of those passages in Holy Writ which dealt with the abominations of Israel. This Rabbi (R. Joshua) controverted the doctrine of the Gnosis, the blending of which with Judaism had hitherto met with little or no opposition (*vide Joël, Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, I., p. 154 ff.). We see, however, that this portion was considered dangerous at an earlier period, namely, at the establishment of the Canon. We are told (*B. Shab.* 13b) that the Book of Ezekiel was nearly excluded from the Canon on account of its containing contradictions of the Torah. This happened in the year 67.<sup>1</sup> Were these inconsistencies never noticed before, or were they accepted without demur?

In reference to the section of the Prophet Ezekiel, mentioned before, we must not forget that it was considered dangerous only with respect to the illiterate. The learned were never prohibited either to read or explain Ezek. i. (*Chagiga* ii. 1). Where then did the common people obtain the opportunity of discovering contradictions between the Torah and the Prophets? This must assuredly have been most naturally afforded them by the coupling together of those passages which were inconsistent—by the reading of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Grätz, *Geschichte*, III<sup>4</sup>., pp. 473 and 810.

Ez. xliv. as Haftara to Lev. xxi. Hence it may be inferred that the practice of reading Sabbath Haftaras was already in vogue before the destruction of the Temple. A similar deduction might be derived from the account given in the Apostolic writings. True it might be objected that the people were not sufficiently acquainted with the Hebrew tongue to appreciate the differences existing between the Prophet and the Torah, and that there was no Aramaic translation at such an early period.

We know, however, that the composition of the Targum to the Prophets in its most ancient form must be dated in the first half of the first century (Bacher: *Aggada der Tannaiten*, I., p. 23). This fact also may be taken as confirming the opinion that portions of the Prophets were then read, for the making of a translation at that period implies that it was wanted. This want could nowhere have been more strongly felt than in the Synagogue, where the Prophets had to be expounded in public. All accounts therefore agree in dating the regular Sabbath readings out of the Prophets before the destruction of the Temple. It cannot, however, be decided, through want of documentary evidence bearing on this matter, whether already before the common era the institution of the Haftara extended to the festivals and extraordinary Sabbaths.<sup>1</sup>

How then did the introduction of the prophet readings originate? We saw above that the most ancient Sabbath portions came into vogue on account of the controversy ensuing between the Pharisees and the Samaritans on the one hand, and the Sadducees on the other. The Samaritans accepted the Torah, but did not acknowledge the prophetic writings. The Pharisees, however, who laid stress on spreading the knowledge of Holy Writ, and as under-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hoffmann (*Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* IX., p. 162) only proves—from the history of the Mishna—that there were no Haftaras specially fixed for the festivals and the four special Sabbaths at the time of the first redaction of the Mishna by Hillel. There can be no doubt, however, as to the existence of Haftaras at that period.

stood by them, soon noticed that numerous passages in the prophets supported their explanation of the Pentateuch. A two-fold object was attained by the appeal to these books. First, they proved the equal importance of the prophetical and Pentateuchal Scriptures by showing that the former also contained laws and observances; secondly, the views of the Pharisees were considerably strengthened thereby. This latter support was also necessary as a means of opposing the Sadducees, who, as we saw, occasioned by their polemics the establishment of several Sabbath lessons. We must, therefore, look for the earliest Haftaras in those passages of the Prophets which could be utilised in the controversy concerning the festivals and the Temple worship. There was certainly no prophet who spoke so scathingly on this matter as Ezekiel, who devoted a part of his prophecy to this very purpose. We have already found that passages from this book were read as Haftaras in the first century, so that we must seek the earliest prophet portions in this book. The verses which are specially mentioned by tradition (*B. Menachoth* 45a) as containing contradictory matter are Ez. xlvi. 18, 20, and xliv. 31. The first verse speaks of the 1st of Nissan, the second of the 7th of the same month, and the third of the food which the priests were forbidden to partake of. The first passage then must have been recited, as it is at the present day, on the 1st of Nissan; and in this way we arrive at the chapter out of which were chosen the first Haftaras. If we examine seriatim the verses of this portion we notice that verses 18-25 treat of the festivals, and that in ver. 15 the Shekel is expressly named, and thus this might have served in the earliest days of the institution as the Haftara for Sabbath Shekalim; and, in fact, we find this passage cited as Haftara for this Sabbath, as we shall shortly see. Further, Ez. xxxvi. 25 was already in ancient times the prophet portion for Sabbath Para, and in similar way xlvi. 17 was selected for one of the extraordinary Sabbaths. We must add to this that the passages interdicted as Haftaras by some

rabbis belong to Ezekiel. In this way we arrive at the certain conclusion that the earliest Haftaras were taken from this book, and were originally assigned to the festivals and special Sabbaths. These were recited immediately after the reading of the Torah portion, which had to be explained by the passage from the Prophets. For the homilies on the festival and the Sabbath did not succeed the Torah reading, but the Haftara. Since this formed the conclusion of the reading and divine worship<sup>1</sup> (*vide* Rappoport, *Erech Millin*, Article אַפְטָרָה) the prophet passage was called אַפְטָרָה or הַפְטָרָה (end). The expression שלמה אַשְׁלָמָה, which is only a translation of אַפְטָרָה<sup>2</sup>, is also applied to the same. Since the Haftara had no significance in and for itself, and was, indeed, only instituted for the purpose of endorsing the Pentateuchal lesson of the day, it was necessary that the person reciting the Haftara should previously read a few verses from the Torah Seder. We find, in fact, this rule explicitly established (*B. Meg.* 23<sup>a</sup>). In this way also we arrive at the motive which prompted the choice of the Haftaras, for only such a passage could confirm and explain the Torah reading, which treated of the same subject. The Haftaras must, therefore, have been of similar contents to the Pentateuch portion (*B. Meg.* 29<sup>b</sup>).

Let us now look closely into the prophet passages which the Tosefta (*Meg.* iv.) enumerates in detail, together with

---

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to compare with this the explanation of the commentator of Maimuni's *Mishne Torah* (Cat. Neubauer, No. 620, p. 68<sup>b</sup>). נִקְרָא קּוֹרֵא עֲנֵין זֶה מִפְטָר לְפִי שַׁאֲחָר קּוֹרֵא תּוֹ נִפְטָרֵין הָעַם מִבֵּית הַכְּנֶסֶת לְבַתְּיהֶן. אחר מוסף.

<sup>2</sup> In a MS. which contains the enumeration of the Haftaras for the triennial cycle (Cat. Neubauer, No. f. 22). That this word is not similar in meaning to קְבָלָה (*vide* Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, xi. p. 85) is clear from a MS. emanating from Egypt (Cat. Neubauer, e. 20, p. 29<sup>b</sup>), which super-scribes the סְלִוק of the Sabbath יְוָצֵר וְתָאָמֵר צִיּוֹן with the expression אַשְׁלָמָה. This proves clearly how the word was used in Egypt. Besides, the Pesikta Rabbati itself (p. 1<sup>b</sup>) uses the verb in the same sense, saying מִמָּה שָׁהְשִׁlim בְּנֵבִיא; cp. Zunz, *Gottesdienst. Vorträge*, p. 367, note 7.

the Torah readings to which they are attached : we find the four special Sabbaths only provided with Haftaras ; otherwise no festival or Sabbath is mentioned. Ez. xxxvi. 25 is assigned to Para, and xlvi. 18 to Chodesh, so that both are taken from Ezekiel, from which it is again clear that this was the source of the oldest Haftaras. Yet for Shekalim 2 Kings xii. was selected, which choice the Boraitha (*B. Meg.* 29<sup>b</sup>) confirms. This weakens the theory that the prophet portions for the special Sabbaths, as indeed for all other occasions as well, were derived from Ezekiel whenever this book contained appropriate passages. On the other hand, it may be mentioned that the Karaites, who we shall see retained a good many of the old Haftaras, adopted Ez. xlvi. 12 as the Haftara for Shekalim. Since, however, the ancient authorities, as the Boraitha and Tosefta, testify to the other portion, the origin of the latter must be considered. The Talmud (*B. Meg.* 29<sup>b</sup>) gives the same Haftara, and explains its suitability for Sabbath Shekalim, on account of the similarity existing between the words in 2 Kings xii. 5, and Exodus xxx. 12, which is the Seder for Sabbath Shekalim. But there is no similarity of contents, and the verbal agreement does not go even so far as to include the word **בְּנֵי**, which does not occur in 2 Kings xii. We can discover the motive prompting the choice of this passage by examining a third Haftara which the Pesikta Rabbati proffers for the same Sabbath, namely, 1 Kings iv. 20. This verse reads as follows : "Judah and Israel were as numerous as the sand on the sea shore, eating, drinking, and joyous." It is clear that it has nothing in common with Shekalim. It is, however, appropriate for a Pentateuch portion which deals with the numbering of Israel. In reality the Shekalim Seder opens with the words, "When you tell the tale of the heads of the children of Israel, let every person give the ransom of his soul to the Lord when he is counted." This is not then the Haftara for Shekalim, but for the portion which was read on this Sabbath, so that neither the Pentateuch nor prophet passages have any

bearing on the significance of the day itself. It must then have been a product of a time when the special Sabbath had already lost its original signification, of which therefore no consideration was taken, and the Haftara was accordingly chosen with an eye to the wording of the Pentateuch portion (see J. Q. R., V., p. 452). Since, then, 2 Kings xii. 5 is in literal agreement with Exodus xxx. 12, it was apportioned to this Torah passage. Yet, how can we explain the existence of the two Haftaras for one Sabbath? Does it represent only a difference in custom prevailing in various localities? Why did the passages from Ezekiel disappear so early from the Ritual? Let us recall to our minds the fact that the Shekalim reading itself is the result of a development, inasmuch as, originally, Numbers xxviii. was read on Shekalim. It is possible that the passage in Ezekiel was the Haftara for this latter reading, and that both Num. xxviii. and Ez. xlvi. 12 lapsed at the same time, since they were inter-dependent.<sup>1</sup>

Yet this Pentateuch portion was still known among the Babylonians (*B. Meg.* 29<sup>b</sup>), and one of the Rabbis remarked that in Palestine, Numbers xxviii. in the ordinary course of the Sabbath Sedarim, fell on Sabbath Shekalim, *i.e.*, the 1st of Adar. It is interesting to pursue this inquiry for a little while, and to divide the Sedarim accordingly. In the second year of the cycle, Exodus xxx. 2, was reached on Sabbath Shekalim, which was the acknowledged lesson for that day in Babylonia, where also the beginning of the year, for the purpose of reading the Law, was the last Sabbath in Tishri. Apart from the consideration that the account itself was only a makeshift in order to answer the question propounded in the Talmud, and which had no other reason, there is no authority which could lead us to place the commencement of the reading cycle

---

<sup>1</sup> In later times, when, as we shall see, the Haftaras were mostly taken from Isaiah, Isaiah ii. 9 might have been the Haftara, since its initial word corresponded with that of the Pentateuch Seder, which was sufficient to establish a connection (*vide* the older *Pesikta*, p. 11<sup>b</sup>).

on the Sabbath after **שְׁמַחַת תּוֹרָה**. As regards the Haftara named by the *Pesikta* to this portion of the law, we have already seen that it applies not to the Shekalim really, but only to the Sabbath on which this passage happened to be read in the course of the continuous reading of the Torah. To the preacher, however, it seemed appropriate as a text for the Shekalim discourse. He had every right to make this use of it, since it formed the Haftara of this portion when read as the ordinary Pentateuch Seder. We shall see that the author of the *Pesikta Rabbati* adopts a similar line of action in other cases besides the one under discussion.

Those prophet sections named by the Tosefta as Haftaras for Para and Chodesh remained unchanged. No other appropriate passages could be found, since no other prophet makes any allusion to the laws contained in the Pentateuchal lessons for these days.<sup>1</sup> We find, however, that the reading for Sabbath Zachor was not taken from Ezekiel, since the name of Amalek does not occur at all in Ezekiel. In 1 Samuel xv. 2, however, we have the description of the fulfilment of the mandate commanded in the Pentateuch, Deut. xxv. 17. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the passage proffered by the Tosefta was the original Haftara for this Sabbath. The *Pesikta Rabbati* has a different account, taking Judges v. 14 as the Haftara, whose only point of contact with the Pentateuch portion is the mentioning of the name Amalek. We should feel inclined to consider the Haftara as of later origin without being able to justify why the older and more correct Haftara had been allowed to lapse in the synagogue of the author of the *Pesikta*; the Midrash Rabba to Numbers ch. i., however, also cites this Haftara. For from that verse which formed the Haftara for Parasha Zachor (Judges v. 14), it is in the Midrash con-

---

<sup>1</sup> The older *Pesikta*, however, gives another Haftara for Para, 1 Kings v. 13. This verse mentions the cedar tree and the hyssop, which were required for the proper manipulation of the ashes of the Red Cow. At any rate it is certain that the prophet passages cited by the *Pesikta* were Haftaras.

cluded that Joshua, for his bravery in the battle against the Amalekites, was rewarded by God in that the members of his tribe at the time of Deborah bore themselves triumphantly against the same enemy. This connection between the prophetical and Pentateuchal portion read on Purim gives us a simple reason for the choice of the Haftara made by the Pesikta. It is the prophetical lesson for Purim when falling on Sabbath on which Exod. xvii. 8 was read as the lesson,<sup>1</sup> and which had as its Haftara the passage selected for Purim, namely, Judges v. 14. This verse was taken as his text by the preacher.

Before we proceed to discuss the other prophet lessons, it is necessary to take into consideration the decision of an important question. It may be urged that there is no sense in speaking of original and later Haftaras since it is generally accepted that the person who was called up to the Law had free choice of his portion from the Prophets (*vide* Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 7; Schürer, *Geschichte* II., p. 380). The following statement, in Luke iv. 17, is the basis for this assumption:—καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνώναι; καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἰσαίου καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τόπον οὐ δῆν γεγραμμένον.

“He went to the synagogue, as was his wont every Sabbath, and stood up for the purpose of reading.

“The Book of the Prophet Isaiah was given him, and he opened the book and found the place where it was written.”

Since the decision of the question depends on this passage, it is necessary to make a close examination of it. The prophetical lessons differed from those of the Pentateuch in this important point, that whereas the latter had to be read in an unbroken series, the former could always be taken from any place in the prophetical writings. Only one condition had to be fulfilled: the passage

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 456.

must be similar in contents to the Torah portion of that day. This is clear from the origin of the institution itself; and, moreover, the examples quoted by the Mishna, *Boraitha* and *Tosefta*, bear indisputable testimony to the existence of this condition. If, then, it was the context that determined the choice of the Haftara, was it possible that anyone was allowed to stand up, open the book of the prophets, and read whatever passage seemed suitable to him? This, however, is not stated in the above quotation. It says distinctly that the Book of Isaiah was handed to Jesus. Can this be called a perfectly free selection if, out of eight prophetical books from which Haftaras could be taken, and were always taken, only one was handed to the reader to choose a passage from? Was there not, in this way, a great limitation placed on the selection of a passage of similar context to the Torah portion?

The view of a search made entirely according to the discretion of the person called up was based on the interpretation of *εὗρεν*, "he found." The word, however, has just the opposite meaning. The roll of the Prophets was handed him with the passage to be read already prepared. Jesus opened it, and "found" the place which he did not look for, but which had been previously arranged. I base no argument on the rule that the Torah should never be rolled in public, since it was not enacted in respect to the Prophets; and, moreover, as we shall see for certain purposes, it was allowed in the synagogue to roll the scroll of the Prophets when the Haftara was finished. From these considerations it may be inferred that the person called to the Law was not permitted to choose his own prophetical passage, but that it was the duty of the heads of the synagogue or of the teachers to select an appropriate portion. We must not, however, be induced to think that already in the time of Jesus the Sabbath Haftaras were fixed, since we are not certain whether there were prophet readings for every Sabbath in this period. If, however, it was regular the date of its general acceptance as a fixed

institution could not have been far back. A general question might be asked in reference to this statement in Luke iv. 18-19. We are told that Jesus read Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, and it is doubtful whether Luke means that this formed the beginning of the Haftara, or whether the whole consisted of only two verses. Let us test this matter by reference to established Haftaras. Friedman (*Pesikta Rabbati*, cap. 1, note 1) says that the verse which the preacher took as his text was the concluding one of the Haftara, which, however, consisted of several verses. When we were considering the more extensive Pentateuch readings, we found that in most ancient times one or two verses were adjudged sufficient to each person, and that some time elapsed before it was decided to read twenty-one verses every Sabbath. Hence it may be deduced that at the earliest period of the introduction of the Haftaras, these consisted of only a few verses, especially since the prophet lesson had only to strengthen what was contained in the Torah passage, for which endorsement one or two verses would suffice. The ancient authorities, indeed, afford us proof for this theory. The Tosefta (*Meg.* iv. 3) enacted that only one verse at a time should be read from the Torah to the translator, and not more than three from the Prophets; if, however, the latter were not intimately connected with each other they had to be read separately. The Tosefta (*Meg.* iv. 18) adduces an example for the second case in order to make the rule intelligible; namely, Isaiah lii. 3, 4, 5 (cp. *B. Meg.* 24a). These three verses had the same value as an ordinary nine, since each had to be read separately. The Tosefta makes no mention of the following verses which had to be read together in sets of three; whence it may be inferred that it considered these three verses as constituting the whole Haftara. Moreover, it is clear from the MS., which enumerates the Haftaras of the triennial cycle,<sup>1</sup> that these short

---

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 39.

Haftaras were in vogue not only in the second and third centuries but also in the Middle Ages. We find in this MS. that in certain cases the direction פסוקין פקט ("two verses, not more,") was added to the initial and concluding words of the Haftara which had only two verses, to distinguish such Haftara from those prophet portions which contained several verses, *e.g.*, the Haftara to Gen. vi. 9 ; xvii. 1 ; xx., and Exod. xiii. The Tosefta in reference to Isaiah lii. 3-5, which formed the Haftara to Gen. xxxix. 1, conveys a similar opinion that three verses were sufficient. We can easily understand from this that Ez. xlvi. 17, and—according to the Boraitha and Pesikta—Isaiah lxvi. 23, which contain in brief the contents of the portion read from the Torah on a Sabbath which was also a New Moon, or allude to the signification of the occasion, were only one-verse Haftaras, since the verse immediately following, Ez. xlvi. 18, speaks of another day, and has no connection with Sabbath and New Moon. The Pesikta, which takes this verse as text, thus did not consider it as the last verse of an extensive piece, but as the Haftara for the day. This is also the case with Ez. xxxvi. 25, which is assigned as the Haftara to Sabbath Para by the Tosefta and Pesikta, which is also found as the initial verse, and not as the end of the Haftara, in the Karaitic and Egyptian Rituals (Cat. Neubauer, No. d. 3). It was only natural that the Haftaras should not always keep to their one verse, especially after they had lost their original import, and no longer served the purpose of explaining the Torah reading, but were recited with the object of propagating a knowledge of the prophetic writings. The Haftaras were extended in a similar manner to that adopted in the enlargement of the Pentateuch portions, first to three verses then to ten, finally reaching twenty-one (*J. Megilla* iv. 2; *B. Meg.* 23a). Just as in the case of the Torah Sedarim so it was with the number of verses of the Haftara: for a long time it was pure theory, not being actually adopted in the practice of the synagogue. The Talmud (*J., loc. cit.*) says that if there

is a Meturgeman who translates the prophet passages, then three verses would be sufficient (cp. *Tractate Sopherim* xii. 7, xiv. 1, where three, five, and seven verses are mentioned for this case). An Amora (*B. Meg.* 23a.) demonstrates this by fact; for he points to *Jer.* vii. 21 as an accepted Haftara which contained less than twenty-one verses. As the reason for this fact, which contradicts the theory, we are told that the contents of the passage come to an end before the twenty-one verses. The same Rabbi cites R. Jochanan as a support, who never allowed more than ten verses to be recited at a time, even if the subject did not cease there.<sup>1</sup> These rules were only faithfully adhered to at a later period, when the principle was adopted that the Haftara should open and end with good tidings (*Meg.* iii. 8). In this way several verses were added to the actual Haftara, generally at the conclusion, which had nothing in common with it. Since verses with favourable tidings were not always to be found, to offer consolation at a time of dire persecution and cruel oppression, the Mishna (*Meg.* iv. 4) allowed the omission of verses which were not appropriate in the same book, and in the case of the minor prophets permission was given to skip from one to the other (*Tosefta Meg.* iv. 18). It is superfluous to adduce individual examples of this proceeding, since there were very few prophet readings which did not suffer similar treatment, as we shall see from the MSS. It seldom happened however that the actual Haftara verse was not retained as the initial one, or that sundry verses were read before it.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> MS. Cat. Neubauer, No. e. 31 has in fact only eight verses for *Lev.* vi. 1, whose Haftara was formed by the piece mentioned. We shall presently explain this.

<sup>2</sup> In the Middle Ages the reason was sought why the Haftara should be arranged to consist of exactly twenty-one verses, it not being observed that it was borrowed from the twenty-one verses of the Torah Seder. The MS. Cat. Neubauer, No. 620, p. 68<sup>b</sup>, mentions in this commentary on Maimuni as the reason, that the smallest Prophet work, Obadiah, consisted of twenty-one verses וַיֹּשֶׁב עֲנֵן וּמִפְתִּירֵין בָּה.

The Tosefta cites as the Haftara for Shekalim, 2 Kings xii. If we wish to decide on the basis of the result that has hitherto been attained what verses in this chapter were assigned to Shekalim, we are compelled to limit the Haftara to verses 5-6, since these alone have any allusion to the Torah portion which belongs to this Sabbath. There is opposed to this opinion, however, a statement in the Talmud (*J. Meg.* iv. 5), where an attempt is made to place limits on the freedom allowed in omitting prophet verses and reading the following; as an example is quoted, יְהוָיֶדֶע חֲכָהַנִּ, which is the Haftara for Shekalim in vogue amongst us. No further explanation is given as to what is meant thereby. Müller (*Tractate Sopherim*, p. 157) expounds this remark to imply that 2 Kings xi. 1-7 was read as introduction, after which followed the actual prophet section. Two facts, however, controvert this view. First, in the time of the Talmud no verse was placed before the initial Haftara verse. Secondly, Müller's explanation does not agree with the proper sense of the word מִדְלֵינִ. It is much more probable that the skipping applied to the reading of ch. xii. 10 directly after verses 5, 6, since this was appropriate for the Sabbath.

We now approach the consideration of the prophet readings in vogue on the festivals, which are enumerated in detail by Boraitha *B. Meg.* 31a.<sup>1</sup> It might have been expected that these should have been taken from Ezekiel xlvi., since several verses in this chapter treat of the various festivals; moreover, we have already noticed that the Haftaras for Chodesh and Shekalim were taken from this passage. None of the ancient authorities, however,

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport (*Erech Millin*, p. 168b) assumes that only the festivals and the four special Sabbaths were provided with fixed Haftaras, the others being left to the discretion of the מִפְטָחָר. We have already had occasion to note, however, that there existed other fixed Haftaras besides those mentioned by Rappoport. We have already pointed out that Isaiah lii. is cited by the Tosefta as an example of a generally accepted Haftara. Jeremiah vii. was also an established prophet reading.

name any festival Haftaras as being derived from Ezekiel. At the same time, it does not by any means exclude that there existed festival portions extracted from this prophet's writings. פסח גָּלְגָּלֶל from Joshua is assigned to the first day of Passover, by which is meant ch. v. 10, where we find described the Passover that was celebrated at Gilgal. On the other hand, the *Halachoth Pesukoth* (p. 132) and *H. Gedoloth* (p. 617), contradicting the Boraitha in the Babylonian Talmud, selected Joshua iii., which section, it must be admitted, is decidedly suitable as a Passover reading. The Spanish Jews also adopted the latter as their Passover Haftara. The existence of the two prophet passages for one festival can, without difficulty, be explained on the basis of a triennial division of the Torah Sedarim. Joshua v. 20 is in almost literal agreement with Num. ix. 2 and 3, which portion, as we saw (p. 439), formed the Pentateuchal lesson for the first day Passover in the third year of the cycle. In the second year Exod. xii. 29 was read, with which Joshua iii. 5 corresponds; so that we meet here again with the fact that was noted in connection with the consideration of the Shekalim portion: namely, the Haftara for Passover was not selected for the occasion, but was the Haftara of the portion which was, in the regular triennial cycle, reached on the Passover.<sup>1</sup> Since the stage in the development immediately preceding must have been represented by the selection of prophet portions for the festival and such as were appropriate to its import, we may very well assume that these latter were derived from the verses contained in Ezekiel xlvi. Having apportioned the Haftaras to the second and third years of the cycle it behoves us now to find one for the first. We have already several times noticed that the Babylonian teachers were always guided by the Palestinians in their decisions concerning the Torah readings. Consequently, their prophet portion for the festivals must, for the most

---

<sup>1</sup> The Haftara instituted at a later time and taken from Isaiah xliv. 26) is preserved in the Pesikta.

part, have been derived from a Palestinian model. For the second day of Passover, which was a Babylonian innovation, they (the Babylonians) assigned as Haftara, 2 Kings xxiii. 21.<sup>1</sup> We know from other sources (p. 442) that Gen. iv. constituted the Pentateuch Seder for the first day of Passover in the first year of the cycle, which led to the assumption that the sacrifices of Cain and Abel were Paschal offerings ; consequently, the Haftara quoted, which describes the Paschal oblations of the King Josiah, was peculiarly suited for this Pentateuchal lesson.<sup>2</sup>

The Boraitha names 2 Samuel xxii. for the seventh day of Passover. Let us not forget, however, that the Torah portion of this day was assigned to it in the ordinary course of the reading of the law, and that it contained an account of the passage through the Red Sea, together with the Song (Ex. xv.). The prophet lesson for the day had to refer to the miracle, or consist of a song of thanks after a rescue from some danger. The passage, 2 Sam. xxii., corresponds to the latter, inasmuch as it is stated, as a superscription to the prayer, that it was composed after the poet had been delivered from the hands of his enemy. On the other hand, the Babylonians selected Isaiah x. 32 to xi. 16 as the Haftara for the eighth day, which verses apply to the incident of the Red Sea miracle, so that we have before us a second prophet reading, which deals with the other event described in the Pentateuch reading. We cannot expect here three Haftaras for the different years of the cycle, since the same portion was recited every year. When the ordinary

<sup>1</sup> Verse 21 forms the commencement of the original prophet lesson, according to the Karaites and also in the MS. quoted by Hildesheimer (*הלבות נדולות*, p. 617, note) ; he, however, considers this astonishing and unintelligible. We have already demonstrated above that in the early Middle Ages the initial Haftara verses were not allowed to be changed. Verses were added only after the Haftara.

<sup>2</sup> For the original reading in Leviticus xxiii., which we saw was generally accepted, the Haftara might have been Micah vi. 3. This is, in fact, treated as a Passover Haftara by the Pesikta (p. 76b).

Sabbath Sedarim were read on the festivals, as we have already shown, corresponding prophet passages were recited with the Torah Sedarim, Gen. v. and Num. x. respectively; of these, however, we find no trace in the ancient sources, since these did not seem appropriate for Passover. The Boraitha proffers two Haftaras for Shabuoth. One Pentateuch portion, Deut. xvi. 9, is connected with Habakkuk; the other, Exod. xix., with Ezekiel i. The astonishing phenomenon that there should already have existed at such an early period a difference of opinion in respect to the prophet readings is explained by the fact that there was a similar lack of unanimity in regard to the Torah readings of the same festival. Both prophet portions describe the appearance of God, an account of which is also to be found in the festival portion, Exod. xix. and also in the lessons, Gen. xv. and Num. xvi., which were apportioned to Shabuoth in accordance with the continuous reading of the Torah. This division affords us the explanation of the selection of Ezekiel i. for Shabuoth, since we find there no allusion to the significance of the festival, and, besides, a date is given at the head of the chapter which does not agree with that of the festival.

But Ezekiel i. 4 is in almost literal identity with Gen. xv. 12, and therefore Ezekiel i. would be a fitting Haftara for Gen. xv. Habakkuk is cited by the Boraitha without any more definite qualification. The different rituals are almost at one, however, in placing the beginning of the Haftara as iii. 1; only a few have ii. 20, as beginning. For the third year, when Numbers xvi. was recited, Isaiah vi. 1 might have been chosen, which chapter the different rituals were unanimous in applying to Exod. xix., since it contains a description of the Revelation of God. It is connected, moreover, with Num. xvi. 20-35, whose context also corresponds with the import of the festival.<sup>1</sup> When

---

<sup>1</sup> The date given in Acts ii. 1 is Shabuoth. In vv. 16-21 Joel iii. 1-5 is introduced and explained. This would lead us to the assumption

the Babylonians introduced a second day of Shabuoth, they found two prophet portions at their disposal. They reversed their order, however, as the Talmud points out.<sup>1</sup>

The Boraitha mentions two Haftaras for the New Year, which, as was the case with the festival just treated, are connected with the different Pentateuch portions: namely Jeremiah xxxi. 19 was attached to Leviticus xxiii., and 1 Samuel ii. to Gen. xxi. Rashi has already remarked that the existence of the expression זכור אזכרנו in the first Haftara occasioned its choice, since the festival was called חכירון, "Day of Memorial." The selection of the other Haftara which describes the visitation of the barren Hannah was due to the similarity of its context with Gen. xxx. 22, which formed the original Torah reading for New Year, and which verse, moreover, bears a striking

---

that this was considered as the Haftara in that service, from which the author gathered his information. This view is supported by the context which describes the propagation of the Divine Spirit and the effect of the appearance of God on Nature, and is similar to that which we saw constituted the contents of the festival portions given above. This passage of the Acts, however, is too vague for us to regard the quotation of a prophetic passage sufficient to accept it as Haftara for this festival without finding any direct reference to it as such.

<sup>1</sup> The words in *B. Megilla*, 31a, could be understood simply to convey that the Babylonians read Exod. xix. and Ezekiel i. on the first day, and Deut. xvi. and Habakkuk iii. on the second. This view is supported by the fact that the succession of the Pentateuch and Prophet books from which the festival Sedarim and Haftaras were respectively taken, is in accordance with the arrangement of the Canon. As a set-off against this we are bound to notice that the command contained in Deut. xvi., in reference to the counting of the weeks, would have been suitable for the first day of the festival, since this followed immediately after, and was dependent on the counting of the weeks. Moreover, the description of the day of the Revelation, which forms the subject matter of Exod. xix., would have been just as appropriate for the second day as for the first, especially as the *Seder Olam* and other traditional works date this remarkable event on the 7th of Sivan. It seems, however, that the reversal of the order applied only to the Haftaras, since Deut xvi. was brought into connection with Ezekiel i., and Exod. xix. with Habakkuk iii. As a matter of fact, these two last are well suited to each other, and we can very well understand that the Babylonians fully appreciated the analogy between them, and read them together accordingly.

analogy to that expounded by the Pesikta Rabbati with reference to the New Year, namely, 1 Sam. ii. 21. This same sentence is equally appropriate to the portion selected in later times for the Torah reading of the New Year, namely, Gen. xxi. The Karaites read as Haftara Joel ii. 1, which celebrates the festival as **יום תרועה**, this making the third prophet portion assigned to New Year. We see clearly from the Pesikta Rabbati, which discusses this same verse in its New Year Piska, that it was not originally introduced by the Karaites (*vide* Friedmann to the passage, and the quotation from Midrash Yelamden in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XIV., p. 96). The Pesikta d. R. Kahana apportioned it as Haftara to the Sabbath immediately following New Year. This had its origin in the fact that the author did not know exactly what to do with this portion, which was no longer known to him as the Haftara for the festival. He therefore assigned it to **שבת השובנה**, with which the verse in question has nothing in common. The existence of the three prophet sections is not only explicable, but also necessary in accordance with the triennial cycle, since in the ordinary course of the reading three Torah Sedarim were reached on the three New Year Festivals of the cycle. We must now connect each with its respective prophet passage. We shall receive great help in this matter from the data already arrived at, and also from the Midrash. Apart from the consideration that 1 Sam. ii. 21 is contextually connected with Gen. xxi., a Midrashic work bears testimony to the existence of the former as Haftara to the latter.

I have already explained above (p. 431) that the Genesis Aggada (Jellinek, *Beth-hammidrash* IV.) is in perfect agreement with the reading of the Law in a triennial cycle. Every section of this collection has three divisions. The first consists of a discussion on the Sabbath Seder from the Pentateuch, the second on its Haftara verse, and the third is based on a verse from the Psalms, which latter proceeding we shall have to deal with. The Midrash

is in an imperfect state of preservation, yet it gives a full account of the Pentateuch and prophet readings, as will be manifest to us when we come to consider the individual Haftaras. This Aggada assigns as the Haftara to Gen. xxi. the passage already cited as the New Year Haftara, namely, 1 Sam. ii. 21. Since this Haftara—confirmed on many sides—was selected on account of its similarity with the Pentateuch portion, it may be assumed that this had to be read also on the ordinary Sabbath, on which this Seder (Gen. xxi. or xxx.) happened to fall in the regular course of the reading. In reality we see that in the Genesis Aggada the passage in question is named as Haftara for the Sabbath on which the above chapters from Genesis were read as the ordinary Seder of the day. Should this fact not clear up all doubt on the matter, I adduce as another proof the MS. (see below, p. 39), which in the succession of the Haftaras in a triennial cycle brings 1 Sam. ii. 21 into connection with the Pentateuch reading, Gen. xxi. Apart from this additional demonstration derived from the division of the Sedarim, we have already established the fact that Gen. xxx. 22 was a New Year Seder. This view receives further confirmation from the Haftara; for if this Pentateuch Seder were once recited on New Year, its prophet lesson must necessarily have been similar to the New Year Haftara. Not only is it similar to, but it is identical with, that which treats of the visitation of Hannah, with this trifling exception—since the same piece was not read twice—that it commences with 1 Sam. i. 11. This is the Haftara which is adopted at the present time for New Year. Both the Genesis Aggada and the MS. of Haftaras agree on this point, thus leaving no doubt as to the authenticity of this Haftara. It is to be inferred, then that one of the New Year's Haftaras, 1 Sam. ii. 21, belongs to the first year of the cycle. We further discovered that Lev. i. or iv. was assigned to the New Year in the second year of the cycle. Which of the two remaining prophet portions shall we attach to this Seder, which is descriptive

of the sacrifices ? The Midrash will afford us some help in this matter. Rappoport (*Erech Millin*, p. 171) has already attempted to explain what appears to be remarkable in the arrangement of Genesis Rabba. We find very few chapters of this work introduced by prophet verses, whereas a large number are headed with selections from the Hagiographa. His opinion is that these chapters are not original; either they have been added at a later time, or they must be coupled with their respectively preceding sections, so that the 100 divisions of the Genesis Rabba are brought down to 88. Dr. Lerner (*Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, VIII., p. 178) partly endorses this view, but without giving any explanation how these prophet verses came to be chosen. The Genesis Aggada, by its adoption of the Sedarim of a triennial cycle, proves to us that its discussions also apply to the prophet portions of such a system. In the interpolated sections of the Midrash Rabba supplied with prophet verses, we have survivals of the discourses based on the Haftaras of a triennial cycle, as we shall explain elsewhere with full detail.

It is sufficient for us to remark here that Leviticus Rabba ch. ii. has as opening sentence Jer. xxxi. 19, the Haftara for the New Year. Since now it resulted from the division of the Sedarim that Leviticus i. was read on the New Year in the second year of the cycle, it is clear also that the Haftara from Jeremiah mentioned in the Boraitha also applies to the second year of the cycle. The prophet passage still remaining, Joel ii. 1, is, therefore, to be assigned to the third year, when Deut. v. formed the Pentateuchal lesson. It corresponds not only with the import of the festival, but also with the Torah Seder.

Isaiah lvii. 15 was unanimously accepted as the Haftara for the day of Atonement. Hence it is to be concluded that it was read in all three years of the cycle, and for this reason, that it is altogether independent of the Torah section, and was selected only on account of its bearing on the signification of the festival. The only point that admits of

discussion is the length of the passage. Did it consist only of the first verse (15) or was it a longer portion? The latter view is supported by the fact that the Fast day is described in ch. lviii. Nothing can be decided from the account of the Boraitha, which only gives the initial verse of the Haftara. R. Jochanan's statement (*Meg.* 31a), however, which is mentioned in connection with the Boraitha, may perhaps be of assistance to us in the solution of the question. The former authority mentions only the first verse of the prophet section, in the same manner in which we have already seen the Pesiktas deal with the Haftaras, and on this account we may infer that only one or two verses were read. Let us dwell for a little while on the Aggadic remarks of R. Jochanan, who is already known to us as the arranger of the Palestinian Torah lessons (p. 462). This Rabbi's discourse is based on three verses. The first is derived from the Pentateuch, the second from the Prophets, and the third from the Hagiographa. We mentioned above that as a result of the division of the Sedarim, Deut. v. was read on the third New Year of the cycle, and therefore Deut. vi. 4-vii. 11 was apportioned to the day of Atonement. The last verse of the festival reading is the Pentateuch sentence cited by R. Jochanan,<sup>1</sup> the prophet verse is taken from the portion of the Haftara, and, as we shall see later on, the Psalm

---

<sup>1</sup> It must not be concluded from the circumstance that the Haftara verse is connected with the last sentence of the Torah reading, that this latter was repeated by the **מפטיר**—as is the custom now—after it had already been recited by the **שכיע**. Neither the Mishna nor any of the Palestinian sources make any mention of this practice, or the usage dependent on it; namely, the reading by the Maftir out of a second copy of the Law on Festivals. It is, indeed, true that the Tosefta (*Meg.* iv., 17) ordains that on the day of Atonement the Maftir should read a special Torah passage. It adds, however, that this second portion, which was simply a commemoration of the reading of the High Priest, had to be recited by heart. The Boraitha (*B. Meg.* 31a), although completed in Babylon, is equally reticent with regard to the Maftir reading. The question was first mooted in Babylon as to whether the Maftir had to be summoned to the Torah as seventh or eighth (Cp. *Tractate Sopherim*, xi. 4, xvii. 3).

verse is derived from the section of the Hagiographa read that same day. The various verses that are thus brought together in an Aggadic observation are not chosen at the discretion of the Aggadist, but are selected from the portions of the Bible assigned to the same Sabbath or festival. A knowledge of this fact is of extreme importance for the adequate understanding of the Aggada.

In respect to the day of Atonement we have yet to add that the Mincha portion of this festival is not referred to in any of the Palestinian Halachic writings. The statement as to this Mincha Haftara found in the Boraitha already quoted is of Babylonian origin, as many others are. The Book of Jonah, without any further qualification, is given as the Mincha Haftara. It is hardly possible that the whole four chapters were recited as Haftara in the third century, when the prophet portions were the reverse of extensive. Since the first and fourth chapters have no application to the day of Atonement, they are not to be considered as forming part of the original Haftara. Ch. iii. 8 is especially appropriate for the festival on account of its allusion to repentance, and its exhortation to the men of Nineveh to return unto God.<sup>1</sup> (Cp. *Taanith* ii. 1).

Let us proceed now with the institution of the festival Haftaras. The Boraitha establishes Zachariah xiv. for the first day of Succoth, in which chapter—verses 16-19—the festival is named several times.<sup>2</sup> The Babylonians, who

---

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that the Tosefta, *Taanith* ii. 1, does not cite this verse from Jonah, but Isaiah lviii. 3, 5, whence it may be inferred with some degree of certainty that this passage was read on fast-days, and, if there was a Mincha Haftara in vogue in Palestine, on the day of Atonement as well. We saw above that the Torah reading for the afternoon commenced where the morning reading ended, since the Torah was forbidden to be rolled on festivals. This might have also been the case with the Mincha Haftara; and since Isaiah lvii. was recited in the morning, the following chapter might have been read in the afternoon (cp. *J. Taanith* ii. 1, where in connection with the fast-day Jonah iii. 8 is referred to).

<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, it seems that the Haftara commenced with verse 1, on account of its reference to the Messianic age. See later on.

introduced a second-day festival, have as Haftara for this occasion 1 Kings viii. 2, where, at any rate, the festival is mentioned. The Karaites had a third Haftara in Isaiah iv. 6, which verse commences with the expression זְסִכָּה; no allusion, however, is made to the feast itself. Thus we obtain three Haftaras which correspond to the three years of the cycle; and it is, moreover, possible for us to apportion each to their respective readings from the Law of the three years.

In the first year Gen. xxxii. *seq.* or xxxiv. formed the reading for Tabernacles, where in xxxiii. 17 סִכּוֹת is mentioned as the name of the place to which Jacob journeyed, and which he so named because he built huts there for his cattle. We must assign Zachariah xiv. as the Haftara for the first year, since the beginning of this chapter is appropriate to the contents of Gen. xxxiv. The Torah reading for the second year displays no similarity of subject, nor any point of connection with either of the two remaining Haftaras, which might guide us in selecting the one in preference to the other. To the Seder of the third year, however, Deut. viii.-ix., Isaiah iv. 6 must be annexed as Haftara on account of their obvious connection with each other. The second Haftara, which describes the inauguration of the Temple of Solomon, must accordingly be coupled with the consecration festival described in Lev. ix.-x.

The Boraitha names 1 Kings viii. 65 as the Haftara for שְׁמֵינִי עַצְרָת; to which the Babylonians add 1 Kings viii. 22 for the additional (ninth) day celebrated by them. Later authorities give Joshua i. as the Haftara for this occasion. It is questionable, however, whether this newly introduced Haftara is not to be ascribed to the later development of the ninth day into "the day of the Rejoicing of the Law," since this additional festival is nowhere described in the Talmud as שְׁמַחְתָּה תּוֹרָה,<sup>1</sup> although Deut. xxxiii. was appor-

---

<sup>1</sup> It is to be inferred from the account of the חֲלוֹת מְנֻהָנִים No. 48 (Zunz, *Gottesd. Vorträge*, p. 3, note f), according to which the Palesti-

tioned to the last day of the festival as Torah Seder by the Talmudical source. If we now glance back at the prophet portions for the festivals, we see that in most cases there exist three Haftaras for the festivals celebrated by the Palestinians, which correspond to the three years of the cycle. These for the most part are not appropriate to the import of the festival, but to the Torah Sedarim that happened to be recited on those days in the continuous course of the Law reading.

The fixing of prophet passages for the four extraordinary Sabbaths and the festivals led to apportioning Haftaras to שבת חול המועד (Pesach and Succoth) and also to Sabbath Chanucca and Sabbath New Moon. We have already remarked that the Tosefta contains no account of the festival portions; we can hardly expect it to mention, therefore, the Haftaras for חול המועד. It is to be concluded from the utter want of regulations regarding the readings on those days that they were treated as ordinary Sabbaths, no consideration whatsoever being taken of the fact that they were half-holidays; so that these remained unfurnished with Haftaras as long as the Sabbaths were in a similar bare position. A change seems to have been first brought

---

nians celebrated a שמחת תורה every three years, that the Babylonians borrowed from them also this signification of the festival, which, however, the Palestinians must have observed some other time, since they had no ninth day. It was on this account that the reading of Genesis i. and Joshua i. was introduced on this festival. In the Middle Ages scholars disputed concerning the choice of the two Haftaras made respectively by the Halachoth Gedoloth and Pesukoth. Maimuni names both (*Tefilla* xiii. 12); on the other hand the Englishman Jacob b. Jehuda says, p. 44 (ברכה ויהי Kaufmann, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV. p. 550), פסוקים מוייעמוד אחריו מорт משה ויש מפטירין ויעמוד שלמה ונכון לקרא נ' So also Ibn Yarchi in *Hammanhig*, p. 71.

As regards the reading of Gen. i. on the Day of Atonement, see above, V., 463, note. Benjamin of Tudela narrates (p. 98), in the passage which treats of the custom of reading the Law in three years, that both congregations prayed together on Shabuoth and last day of Succoth. It cannot, however, be determined from this account whether the Palestinians finished the Law on this latter day and celebrated it as שמחת תורה.

about by Rab, who, as we have several times remarked, devoted considerable care to this religious rite after his return from Palestine. R. Huna mentions in his name the regularly fixed Pentateuch and Prophet portions for Chanucca, Purim and New Moon. In the course of the two centuries that elapsed between the establishment of Haftaras and the institution of Rab, the motive prompting the choice of the prophet portions underwent considerable modification. We notice that the newly introduced Haftaras for the ח'ול המועד (Pesach and Succoth) have no application at all either to the significance of the festival or to the Torah reading of those days, but were calculated to arouse hopes of a Messianic deliverance in the hearts of the people at a time when they were sorely persecuted and oppressed, and were in great need of consolation. This circumstance establishes the Palestinian origin of the introduction. The Haftaras in question were Ezek. xxxvii., which deals with the resurrection of the dead and the revival of the Jewish nation, and Ezek. xxxviii., which describes the war with Gog and Magog that was to be the preliminary to the final Redemption. Yet why should they just be read on the Sabbaths of Pesach and Succoth ? The Gaon Hai (in Chap. קריאת התורה) explains the choice of these Haftaras for Pesach and Succoth, on the ground that according to the Midrash the resurrection of the dead will take place in Nissan, and the war with the nations in Tishri.

As in all the other Aggadic statements hitherto considered, the order of cause and effect has to be reversed. The prophecies were supposed to be fulfilled on certain days because the passages containing them happened to be read on these occasions, and thus a connection was established between the prophecy and the day. The question, then, how did these passages come to be selected, is not yet answered. Let us first recur to the result arrived at above (p. 453) that the ח'ול המועד פסח was provided with a special portion later than ח'ול המועד סוכות; we

must therefore look to the latter for the reason of the choice of the Haftaras under discussion. We found that the Haftara for Succoth in the third year of the cycle was Isaiah iv. 6. This section treats of the Messianic period, and is explained in detail by the Aggada (vide *Baba Bathra* 75a; *Sanhedrin* 92a; *Genesis Rabba*, ch. xlviii.).<sup>1</sup> This gave rise to the idea that the minds of the people should be directed to the subject on Succoth; thence it arose that the Haftara for the Sabbath of the same festival should contain a similar context.

Besides, no prophet describes the time of the Redemption and re-establishment of the State so circumstantially as Ezekiel; and when we remember also that the original Haftaras were derived from this source, we at once arrive at the reason why just Ezek. xxxviii. was selected as the Haftara for Succoth. Once having been introduced for שבת חל המועד סכונות, it was no difficult matter to imagine the idea being carried over to Passover as well. We must notice also in this connection a difference of opinion between the two Tannaim, R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (*B. Rosh Hashana* 10b), in the beginning of the second century, which turned upon the point as to whether the redemption will take place in Nissan, i.e., Pesach, or Tishri, i.e., Succoth.<sup>2</sup>

For Sabbath New Moon we have already named Ezekiel xlv. 17 as the older Haftara, and also the later Haftara emanating from Rab, namely, Isaiah lxvi. 23, which latter was generally adopted. To Chanucca, which, on account of its duration, could include two Sabbaths, two Haftaras were

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Pesikta (p. 187 a, b) this verse is expounded in the same sense in the Piska for the first day of Succoth.

<sup>2</sup> It is now quite intelligible why the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Numbers xi. 26, and also the Targum Jerushalmi should interweave in this passage, an account of the war against Gog and Magog. We found, namely, that in the third year of the cycle, Numbers ix. was read on the first day of Pesach, so that Numbers xi. was reached by the following Sabbath of the festival. This led both Targums to introduce in the above quoted verse some remarks about the Messianic age.

assigned, both of which have reference to the import of the feast. Since it is called the festival of lights, and its Torah Seder moreover treats of the lamps (Num. viii. 1), Zachariah iv. 2, and 1 Kings vii. 49, were selected as Haftaras. Instead of the latter the Pesikta cites vii. 51, in which is narrated the completion of the Temple of Solomon; no mention of lights, however, is made in this verse. If we take into consideration that the Torah reading on Chanucca commenced in later times with Num. vii. 84, which describes the oblations of the tribal princes, then the selection of 1 Kings vii. 51, which deals with the offerings of Solomon, will appear to us appropriate to the Pentateuch Seder (*vide* Rashi and Tosafoth to the passage *Meg.* 31a). We have yet a third Chanucca Haftara given in the later Pesikta, namely, 1 Kings xviii. 31, in which we search in vain for any reference to the festival; for the verse reads, "And Elijah took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of the children of Jacob, to whom came the word of the Lord, 'Israel shall be thy name.'" We thus have three Haftaras, which we must assign to their respective Sedarim in the three years, as we have already done in the other cases which we have so far considered, since this proceeding explained to us the connection of various prophet portions with one and the same festival. In the first year of the cycle the Pentateuchal portion for Sabbath Chanucca was Gen. xlvi. 28, wherein it is stated that the number of souls that travelled into Egypt of the family of Jacob were seventy; and to this context 1 Kings xviii. 31, the Haftara chosen was sufficiently suitable. Should, however, no trust be placed in the Sedarim division so copiously authenticated, the Genesis Aggada removes all doubt in the matter, inasmuch as it ascribes our Chanucca Haftara, 1 Kings xviii. 36, to Gen. xlvi. 28.<sup>1</sup> The Pesikta Rabbati mentions

<sup>1</sup> Since the following section, Genesis xlviii. 1, wherein is described the illness of Jacob, would be read on the second Chanucca Sabbath, we can now understand why the third division of the Pesikta Rabbati, which is devoted to the eighth day of Chanucca, should treat of

yet another Haftara, Zephaniah i. 12, in which verse is contained a reference to lights. In the second year of the cycle, Lev. xxiv. was read, where the lamps of the tabernacle and the regulations concerning the same are explicitly mentioned. Perhaps this suggested the selection of the anomalous portion, Numbers viii. 1, on account of the similarity of its context to that of Leviticus xxiv. We have altogether, then, four Chanucca Haftaras: three for the three years of the cycle, the fourth provided for the emergency of an extra Chanucca Sabbath (*B. Meg.* 31a). In order to give a complete account of R. Huna's dictum, I add here the prophet portion for the ninth of Ab, namely, Jeremiah viii. 13. In place of this the Tractate Sopherim (xviii. 3) strictly defines Jeremiah XIV. 19—22 as the Haftara for this day. This variation is due to the different Pentateuchal readings in vogue, since in Babylon Deut. iv. 25 was read, in Palestine Deut. xxviii. or Num. xiv. (see above, pp. 456, 457). For Sabbath on the day preceding a new moon 1 Samuel xx. 18 is the Haftara chosen.

If we take into consideration all the dates arrived at in our investigation, of the readings for the minor holidays, we notice that for the most part the Haftaras are chosen with a regard to the Pentateuchal Sedarim which happened to fall to the share of these minor festivals in the ordinary course of the Law reading. The Haftaras cited by the Boraitha and Tosefta, as well as those mentioned in the Mishna, are based on their appropriateness to the context of the Torah reading. It is necessary to emphasize this principle, since, as we shall see, it was not always adhered to. In accordance with this fundamental idea, it is not difficult to derive several

---

Jacob's sickness (p. 10). Jakob b. Chananel al-Sikli quotes a discourse of the Yelamden on the priestly benediction taken from the section. This connection of 'בָּנִי' with the priestly blessing is surely to be accounted for by the fact that the former section of Genesis was reached on Chanucca, and that also on this holiday Numbers vi. 22 was read.

Haftaras from Ezekiel xliv., since no passage in the Prophets is more peculiarly suitable for those chapters in Leviticus and Numbers which treat of the sacrifices and the duties of the priests. In this way Ezekiel xliv. 11 might have been selected for Levit. iii. 1; xliv. 15, for Numbers xvii. 16; xliv. 17 for Leviticus viii. 1; xliv. 20 for Levit. xxi. (which holds good now); xliv. 27 for Levit. xvi.; xliv. 29 for Numbers xviii. 25; and xlv. 1 for Numbers xxxiv. 1. The discovery of a Haftara by means of its context is a matter of great perplexity and uncertainty, since we do not know which verse of the Sabbath lesson was considered by ancient teachers as the most important, and therefore formed the basis of the Haftara selection.

Especially is this the case with those Sedarim which have an historical context, since we seldom find in the prophetical works an account supplementary of the Pentateuchal histories, except where a direct allusion is made to an incident narrated in the Pentateuch, as in Joshua xxiv. 1-13; 1 Sam. vi. 6; Judges xi. 16-26; Hosea xii. 4-13; Micah vi. 4, 5. We have yet to deal with these prophet portions. Besides the fact that the context is taken into account, we have another help in another direction. We have already seen that the Seder division of the Pentateuch contained in the Massora has preserved the Sabbath readings for us. The Massora has also a partition of the Prophets into Sedarim, which might have originated from the Sabbath readings. These, however, cannot be identical with the Haftaras, as the Torah divisions were with the sections read on Sabbath, since the Prophets were not recited in unbroken fashion, and, moreover, there are more portions than there were weeks in the three years, and some prophetic Sedarim consist of several chapters. We have to notice a remarkable phenomenon which enables us to decide what was the real import of these prophet Sedarim in the Massora. Whilst on the one hand the Torah was divided into sections with a view to each containing a complete context, on the other hand the Prophet Sedarim

for the most part consist of passages in which the context is not completed. Taking this striking fact into consideration, Müller (*Tractate Sopherim*, p. 221 note) shows a connection between the Haftaras and the Massoretic Prophet divisions, the latter being introduced at the ends of the passages that were read as Haftaras. Let us dwell on some of the Haftaras which we have already discovered and discussed, and let us notice their relation to the Sedarim partition of the Massora. We find, *e.g.*, that the Seder, Joshua iii. 7, begins two verses after the Pesach Haftara; 1 Kings iv. 20 commences with Shekalim; 2 Kings xii. 3, two verses before Shekalim; Isaiah iv. 4, two verses before Succoth; lii. 7, at the end of the Haftara, assigned by the Tosefta to Gen. xxxix.; Jeremiah vii. 23, after the third verse of that Haftara mentioned in the Talmud; Ezek. xlvi. 16, and xxxvi. 25, are verses actually found in the Haftaras for Sabbath Chodesh and Sabbath Para, respectively. This fact is not only of assistance to us in determining the extent of these individual Haftaras,<sup>1</sup> but it also gives us the passages where the ancient Haftaras have to be sought.

The Massoretic division apportions 1 Sam. vi. 14, which briefly describes the duties of the Levites, to the same subject in Num. iv. 17; 1 Sam. x. 24, to Deut. xvii. 24; Joshua xvii. 4, to Num. xxvi. 52; xxi. 41, to xxxiv. 1; Judges ii. 7, to Deut. xxxi. 14; xviii. 7, to Num. xiii. 1; xix. 20, to Gen. xxiv.; 1 Kings vi. 11-13, to Exod. xxv.; viii. 56-58, to Lev. ix.; x. 9, to Gen. xiv.; xvii. 24, to Exod. xviii.; xviii. 39, to Deut. vi.; 2 Kings xiii. 23, to Deut. x.; xx. 8, to Exod. iii.; Jeremiah ix. 22-24, to Deut. viii.; xii. 15, to xxx.; xxix. 8, to xviii.; xxxviii. 8, to Gen. xxxvii.; Ezek. xii. 20, to Lev.

---

<sup>1</sup> In *Megilla* 23b, Jeremiah vii. 21 is cited as an example of a short Haftara; Müller (*Tractate Sopherim*, p. 187) is of opinion that this section contained seventeen consecutive verses. It is possible, however, that it was much shorter, since verse 23 concluded the Massoretic Seder, which, in all probability, formed also the end of the Prophet portion. In fact, we saw above that this had only three verses.

xxvi. 4 ; xx. 41 to Lev. i. This series might have been doubled in length, yet sufficient instances are given to establish the fact that where a Massoretic Seder is to be found in the Prophets after a verse where the division cannot be justified by its context, we must suspect that it was a prophet portion for a Sabbath of the triennial cycle. Since, however, in the want of support for each separate Seder, this conjecture is of an indefinite nature, we require yet another reason for considering these Sedarim as actual Haftaras. The supports are given us by those chapters of the Midrashim, which commence with prophetical verses. We have yet another means of assistance at our disposal. We found several times that when different authorities cited different Haftaras for the same occasion, these latter could be shown to fall in with the arrangement of the Sedarim in accordance with a triennial cycle. We referred especially to the Karaitic accounts, laying great stress on the fact that they retained several old Haftaras; there is also the Yemen ritual, which certainly preserves some prophet portions of ancient date. The prevalence of Palestinian Haftaras among the Karaites admits of a natural explanation. We know that this sect first established itself in Palestine, where its followers adopted many customs in vogue amongst the population, in opposition to the Babylonian practices, which they rejected. They did so that they might assert that it was the Karaites, and not the Babylonian Jews, who maintained the rites of Judaism in their pristine purity.

It cannot, however, be decided whether they adopted the triennial cycle of the Pentateuch reading. Their Haftaras were undoubtedly taken from the Palestinian, since they simply accepted as Haftara of the weekly Sabbath lesson that which was assigned in the Palestinian arrangement of the three-year cycle to the first Seder of present Babylonian weekly portion.

We can therefore consider the Karaite Haftaras as the prophet readings for the first Sabbath Sedarim of the pre-

sent weekly portions. Since, moreover, the Babylonians also borrowed their Haftaras from the Palestinians, they had to act similarly to the Karaites in choosing one out of several assigned in Palestine to one Babylonian weekly portion. It should follow, perhaps, that the prophet passages of the German and Spanish Jews who accepted the Babylonian ritual should be the same as those of the Karaites. This is, however, very seldom the case, a divergence which may be easily accounted for. In the first place, the Haftaras selected by the Palestinians for the first Seder of the weekly portion did not always seem appropriate in the eyes of the Babylonians to the context of the whole Sabbath section. In the second place, they arranged their Haftaras some centuries before the Karaites, at a time when the subject-matter of the Pentateuch reading formed the principle of the selection of the Haftaras. As we shall soon see, this was by no means so strictly adhered to at the time of the Karaites. By invoking to our assistance all these different sources, we arrive at the following Haftaras for the Sabbath Sedarim of the triennial cycle. For Lev. i. 1 we have Isaiah xlivi. 21; vi. 1, Jeremiah vii. 21 (Talmud); viii. 1, Ezek. xlivi. 27; xii. 1, Isaiah lxvi. 7; xiii. 29, 2 Kings v.; xiv. 1, 2 Kings vii. 3; xviii. 1, Ezek. xxii. 1. For xix. 1 we find three Haftaras: the Germans read Amos ix. 7, the Spanish Jews, the Persian rite in the MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 1422, and the Englishman Jacob ben Jehuda, in his **עץ חיים**, prefer Ezek. xx.; whilst the Karaites have Isaiah iv. 3. The last corresponds to the first Seder of the weekly portion; the second, according to the contents of the Haftara assigned to Lev. xviii., is appropriate to Lev. xx., wherein, as in Lev. xviii., is contained the laws of forbidden marriages with blood relations; Amos ix. was substituted for the severe language of Ezekiel. We shall have occasion to notice a similar proceeding to the latter, in other cases. The Midrash Leviticus Rabba, ch. xxiv. commences the Seder Lev. xix. with Isaiah v. 16, which, as we have already seen, represented the Haftara in vogue at the time

of the Aggadist. If we compare this verse with the Haftara proffered by the Karaites, namely, Isaiah iv. 3, we recognise that the first is more appropriate to the context, since it treats of the holiness of God; the second, however, speaks of the sanctity of the remnant of Israel in the time of the Messiah. These prophet portions were assigned to the same Pentateuch Seder at different periods, that of the Karaites being a product of the latest Palestinian development.<sup>1</sup> The Haftara for Lev. xxi. 1 is Ezek. xliv. 25; xxv. 39, Isaiah xxiv. 2; xxv. 1, Jerem. xxxii. 6. There is again a difference of opinion in respect to the portion for Lev. xxvi. 3, the Karaites choosing Isaiah i. 19, which is also the Haftara for Deut. i., and the other rites Jeremiah xvi. 19. We shall treat of the first in connection with the so-called "punishment portions" (פּוֹרָעַנְוָרָא). For Num. i. 1 we have Hosea ii. 1; for the weekly portion נֶשֶׁוֹת the MS. Cat. Neubauer, No. d, 3, gives Hosea iv. 14, which Haftara clearly belongs to Num. v. 11, whilst that adopted in all other rituals, Judges xiii. 2, is assigned to vi. 1. For viii. 1 there is Zech. ii. 14; xiii. 1,

<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that the Karaite Haftara which commences with Isaiah iv. 3, extends to v. 16, and that this latter verse is the prophet reading according to the Midrash. If we had not already seen in all cases that the Midrash invariably cites the beginning of the Haftara as the starting for its discussion in the Sabbath Seder, we should be tempted to believe that the Midrash accepted the Karaite Haftara, taking the last verse as its text. Two MSS. in the Bodleian Library, which emanate from Egypt (Catalogue Neubauer, No. d, 6, and e, 31), assign as Haftara to קְדוּשָׁתִים Ezek. xiv. 1, whose contents make it appropriate for Lev. xx. In addition the language of Ezek. xiv. 4-7 is very similar to that used in Lev. xx. 2-6, which fact alone would certainly have led to the selection of this prophet passage for the Seder in question.

When treating of the Haftara of the Day of Atonement, we observed that R. Jochanan based an Aggadic sentence on a verse from the Pentateuch lesson, one from the Haftara and one from the Hagiographa. The same we find in J. Shekalim, III. 2, where Num. xxxii. 22, Joshua xxii. 22, and Proverbs iii. 4, serve as basis of an Aggadic statement. From this connection of the verses we may infer that Joshua xxii. 22 was the Haftara of Num. xxxii., which is also confirmed by the complete similarity of the contents of both passages.

Joshua ii. 1; xvi. 1 is supplied by the Karaites with Hosea x. 2, by the others with 1 Sam. xi., this latter being the more ancient. The passage for xx. 14 is Judges xi. 1; xxii. 2, Micah v. 6; xxv. 10, Malachi ii. 5, or 1 Kings xix., which is the older, and is retained in the European rituals. It is the selection of this Haftara for Num. xxv. 10 which gave rise to the Aggada connecting Elijah with Phineas. To Num. xxxv. 9 is attached Joshua xx. 1; to xxxii. 1, Jer. ii. The Midrash to Numbers mentions two unknown prophet readings; in the introductory verse of ch. iv. of the Midrash, Isaiah xlivi. 4 is apportioned to Num. iii. 14, and in ch. xxii. Jer. iv. 2 to Num. xxx. These sections are decidedly suitable for their respective Sedarim, and could have very well served as their Haftaras. We have not so many sources at our disposal for discovering the prophet passages for the fifth book, since the Karaites adopted the practice followed by the European communities of choosing as Haftaras for all the Sedarim in Deuteronomy sections from the prophets which dealt with punishment and consolation, and which had no connection with the subject-matter of their respective Pentateuchal passages. This deficiency is made good to some extent by the remarks of Maimuni (end of *ה'הפללה*), the Yemen Ritual, and a South Italian collection of Haftaras (Catalog. Neubauer, No. 6), which contain all the prophet portions corresponding to the context of the individual Sedarim in Deuteronomy. Thus we obtain for Deut. i. 1, Jeremiah xxx. 4;<sup>1</sup> for iii. 23, Jer. xxxii. 16;<sup>2</sup> ix. 1, Jer. ii. 1;<sup>3</sup> xii. 20, Jer. xxiii. 9; xvii. 14, 1 Sam. viii. 1; xx. 10, 1 Sam. xvii. 37; xxvi. 1, Joshua viii. 30; xxix. 9, Joshua xxiv. 1; xxxii. 1, Ezek. xvii. 22—nine additional Haftaras in all. With the help

<sup>1</sup> According to the Midrash, which has a prophet introduction to Deut. ii. 31—which introductory verse, as we have already remarked, represents the Haftara—Amos ii. 9 would be the reading for this Pentateuch portion.

<sup>2</sup> The Midrash has instead 2 Kings viii. 30.

<sup>3</sup> For xi. 26 the Midrash has Jer. xxi. 8.

afforded us by the sources placed at our disposal, we have been able to discover a large series of prophet readings for the last three books of the Pentateuch. If we arrange together the books from which the passages arrived at in this way have been derived, we see that Ezekiel, the historical books, and the Minor Prophets have the largest share; then follows Jeremiah, the least number of all being taken from Isaiah. This will become intelligible to us if we recollect that the original Haftaras introduced for the festivals and the special Sabbaths, and the portions containing references to the Temple and offerings, were selected from Ezekiel. The special rules which the Tosefta enunciates for the reading of the Minor Prophets is sufficient proof that many Haftaras were also borrowed from this source.

The historical writings, in consequence of their subject-matter, were very useful in the choice of historical allusions to similar events narrated in the Pentateuch. It is on this account that so many Haftaras were chosen from these books, as we see in the series of prophet passages still retained in the ritual. Isaiah, on the other hand, who makes very few references to the past events of Israel's life, and does not speak at all of the offerings or the Temple customs, could have been selected only rarely for Sabbath readings. It is necessary to dwell on this fact, since we notice that the Karaites and the MS. dealing with the triennial cycle cite an overwhelming number of Haftaras from the book of Isaiah.

The recently acquired Bodleian MS., which extends from Gen. v. to Lev. iv., and gives us the prophet portion for each Sabbath Seder, with the first word of the initial and concluding verse, includes the historical portion of the Pentateuch. We should accordingly have expected to find the Haftaras mostly taken from those books which contain appropriate allusions to the events that befell the patriarchs, to the Israelites in Egypt, and also to the building of the Tabernacle. Instead of which, however, we find that most

of the passages are chosen from Isaiah. I here give this division, since in its way, as far as is known to me, it is unique, and abounds in points of interest (*Catal. Neubauer*, No. f. 22, p. 24):—

(24) עד כי כה אמר אדני ה' קדוש ישראל בשובה וначת הרשען בהשquet:

שלם' אלה תולדות נח . כימי נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי מעבור עד עניה סערה לא נחמה הנה אכוי : אשלמתו ויזכור אלהים את נח . יי שמעתי שמעך יראתי יי פעלך עד לפנייך דבר ויצא רשות לרגליו : שלמת' צא מן התיבה . לפתח עינים עורות להוציא מכם' עד יי חפש למען צדקו יגדייל : שלם' ויהי בני נח . לאמר לאסורים צאו לאשר בחשך עד

(24b) וראמר צוון עזבני יי ווי שכחני : שלמת' ויהי כל הארץ שפ' . כי או אהפוך אל עמים שפה ברורה עד הנהו עשו את כל מעניך בעית : שלמת' לך לך מארץך . ואקה את אביכם את אברהם מעבר עד ועתה יראו את יי ועבדו אותו : שלמת' ויהי בימי אמראפל . מי העיר ממורה צדק יקראהו עד אל תיראי תולעת יעקב מרתי : שלמת' אחר הדברים . חזון ישועתו בן אמוש אשר חוזה עד למדו היטב דרשו משפט אשרו : שלמת' ושרי אשת אב'

(25) רני עקרה לא ילדה פצחי רנה עד כי מי נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי : שלם' ויהי אברם . כי ההרים ימושו והגבאות תטמיינה עד עניה סערה פסוקין פקט : שלמת' וירא אליו יי . מלך ביפוי תהווינה ענייך תריאינה עד כי יום נקם לי שנות שלומים : אשלם' ויבאו שני המלאכים . לעת עבר והנה בלחה בטרכם בקר עד בעית ההיא יובל שי לוי צבאות : שלמת' ויסע משם אברהם . ונודע בגויים זרעם וצאתיהם בתוך

(25b) עד שוש אשיש ביי פסוקין פקט . וגסמו אשלם' דושאן : שלמת' ווי מקד את שרה . כי פקד יי את חנה ותרה ותולד עד ובחר אתו מכל שבטי ישראל : שלם' והאלים נסה . הן אראים צעקו חוצה מלacci עד כי יי שפטני יי מהתקנו יי : שלמת' ואברהם זון . שמעו אליו רדף צדק מבקשי יי עד ופדוויי יי ישבען ובאו צוון ברנה : שלם' ואבא הימים אל העין . ושבהם מים בשנון מעוני (26) עד ולקחומ עמים והבאים : אשלם' וויסף אברהם . ויקח דוד עוד פלגיים ונשים עד ויוסף עוד דוד את כל בחור : אשלם' ואלה תל' יצחק . לא ייגעו לrisk

ולא ילדו לבלה עד מי שמע כזאת מי ראה כאלה : אשלט' ויזרע יצחק . נשבע יי בימינו ובזורע עזוז אם עד חסדי יי אוצר תחלות יי : שלט' ויהי כי זון יצחק . שמעו אליו בית יעקב וכל שארית בית ישראל העמוסים מני בטן הנשואים

(26) עיר נאלנו יי צבאות שמו קדוש ישראל : שלמה' ויתן לך הא' מטל . והיה שארית יעקב בקרוב עמ' רב' קטל עד הגיד לך אדם מה טוב ומה יי : שלט' ויצא יעקב מב' . ויברא יעקב שדה ארם ויעבד עד לשום לאבלי ציון להת להם : שלט' ויזכר אלהים את רחלה . ותדר נדר וחאמר יי צבאות אם ראה הראה בעני אמרך וכברתני עד ותנה לא עלתה כי אמרה : שלמה' שוב אל ארץ אב' . עמי מה עשית לך ומה הלאיתיך (27) עד תתן אמת ליעקב חמד לאברהם : שלמה' ווישלח יעקב מלא' . חזון עבדיה כה אמר אדני יי לאדום עד ועל מושיעים בהר ציון לשפטו : שלט' ויבא יעקב שלם . כה אמר יי אם שלטמים וכן רביים עד טוב יי למעוז ביום צורה וידעו : שלמה' וירא אלהים אל יעקב . ועתה כה אמר יי בוראך יעקב עד עם זו יצרתי תחולתי יספרו : שלמה' וישב יעקב . וישב עמי בנוה שלום ובמשכנות עד הולך צדוקות ודבר משרים :

(28) שלמה' וירד יהודה מأت . ויספה פליטה בית יהודה הנשארה עד ומכל מלך אשר אחילך ואת : שלמה' וויספה הורד מצרים . כי כה אמר יי חנים נמכרתם ולא בכספ' עד והוא מחלל מפשעינו מדכא מע' : שלמה' ויהי מקץ . והיה כאשר יהלם הרעב והנה אוכל עד ויספו ענויים בי שמחה ואבני : שלמה' הנמצא כזה איש . ונחתה עליו רוח יי רוח חכמה ובינה עד והיתה מסלה לשאר עמו אשר : שלמה' את האלים אני ירא (28) מי בכם ירא יי שמע בקהל עבדו אשר עד ששון ושמחה ישיגו נטו ינון וא' : שלמה' ואל שדי יtan لكم . ותנן לכם ורחים אתכם וחשיב עד כי התענייתם בנפשתריכם כי אתם : שלט' ויגש אליו יהודה . וונשו בני יהודה אל יהושע בגלגול עד ושם חברון לפנים קריית ארבע : שלמה' ואת יהודה שלח . וברתי את בית יהודה ואת בית יוסוף עד ואכח לי שם מקומות אחד : שלמה' הנה אביך חלה . ואלישע חלה את חליו אשר ימות בו (286) עד ויהן יי אותם וירחם ויפן : אשלט' ויקרא יעקב . ולא אתי קראת יעקב כי יגעת בי עד כה אמר יי מלך ישראל ונאלנו יי צבאות : שלמה' בנימן זאב יתרף . הנה يوم בא לי וחלק שלך בקרובך עד וישבו בה וחרם לא יהיה עוד :

ספר ואלה שמות • אשלם' ואלה שמות • הבאים ישרש יעקב  
יצץ ופרח :

(29) עד ביום החוא יהיה יי צבאות לעטרת צבי ולצפירות  
תפארה : שלמה' ומשה היה רעה . כרעה עדרו ירעה בזרעו  
יקבץ עד וקוווי יי וחליפו כח יعلו אבר : שלמה' וילך משה  
ואהרן . כי בשמחה התיאו ובשלום הובלון עד והביאורים אל  
הר קדשי ושת' : שלמה' וארא אל אברהם אל . אני יי הואשמי  
וכבודיו לאחר עד יי חפץ למען צדקו יגדייל : שלם' כי ידבר  
אליכם . ונרתאי מפתחים בשמותים ובארץ עד והיה ביום החוא  
יטפו החרים :

(29) שלמה' כי ידבר אליכם פרעה . ונרתאי מפתחים בשמותים  
ובארץ דם עד והיה ביום החוא יטפו החרים : שלמה' השכם  
בבלק . וירושוה קאות וקפוד וונשות וערב עד ופדרויו יי ישובון  
ובאו ציון ברנה : שלמה' כי אני הכבדיי . ולמה המכבדו את  
לבכם כאשר עד והענגלת באה אל שדה יהושע : שלמה' עוד  
גע אחד . עד מה תהשبون אל יי כליה הוא עשה : שלמה'  
ויהי בחזי הלילה ווי . משא דומה אליו קרא משער שמר עד  
ותקעתו יתד במקום נאמן והיה : שלם' קרש לי כל בכור . שמעו  
אלוי בית יעקב וכל שרarity (30) עד ועד זקנה אני הוא פסוקין  
פרק : אשלם' מה חזק אלוי דבר . והיה טרם יקראו ואני  
עננה עוד עד שמהו את ירושלים וגלו בה : אשלם' עד אתה בירתי  
מאניהם . אם תшиб משבת רגליך עשות עד ואני זאת בירתי  
אתם אמר : אשלם' וישמעו יתרו כהן . שמעו רוחקים אשר  
עשיתך עד כי יי שפטנו יי מתחקנו יי : אשלם' ואתם תהיו  
לי . ואתם כהני יי תקראו משרתי עד שוש אשיש ביי כי  
הלבישני : אשלם' ואלה המשפטים . כה אמר יי שמרו משפט  
ועשו עד אם כסף תלה את עמי את . (30) עד ויאמר לי  
עבדי אתה ישראל : שלמה' ויקחו לי תרומה . תחת הנחתת  
אביא כסף ותחתך עד ונודע בוגדים זרעם וצאנ' : אשלם' ועשית  
פרכת קדם' ואלבישך רקימה עד ולהמי אשר נהרי לך : אשלם'  
את האשכנז תעשה . כה אמר יי החסדים כסאי וחארץ עד למען  
תינקו ושבערתך משד : אשלם' ואתה הצעה את . ילכו ינקתו  
ויהי צוית הודיע וריתה עד קדרשו צום קראו עצרה : שלם' וזה  
הדבר אשר . ואתם כהני יי תקראו משרתי : אשלם' ועשית  
מזבח מקתר . כי מטורח שם ועד מבואו (31) עד כי שפתוי  
כהן ישמרו דעת : אשלם' ראה קראתי בשם . כל הנקרא  
בשמי ולכבודיו בראתיו עד עם זו יוצרתי לי תחלתי יספרו :

אשלה' ויפן וירד משה . וויט שמיים וירד וערפל תחת עד מגודול ישועות מלכו ועשה : אשלה' כתב לך את כל כי זאת הבריות אשר אכרת את עד וככל העמך והפנרים וחדשן : אשלה' ויעש בצלצל . ויאריכו הבדים ווואו ראי עד ויעדם שלמה לפני מזבח יי' : אשלה' אלה פקדוי המשכן . כה אמר יי' הנני שב שבות אהלי (31b) עד בבכי יבוא ובחחנונים אוילcum : אשלה' ויבאו את המשכן . חזה ציון קריית מועדנו עיניך תראינה עד כי يوم נקם לי שנת שלמים : אשלה' ויקרא אל משה . קול יי' לעיר יקרא ותושיה יראה עד אל תשמחי פלשת כל כי נפלתו : אשלה' ונפש כי תחתא . הэн כל הנפשות לי הנהנה כנפשה האב עד מעני השיב ידו נשך ותרכיות : אשלה' ושםעה קול אלה . ויאמר אליו זאת האלה היוצאת עד והעטרות תהיה להלם לטוביה : אשלה' זה קרבן אהרן ובניי . זערבה לוי מנחת יהודה וירושלם עד ואשרו :

Let us examine these Haftaras in detail. Isaiah xxx. 15 is only the conclusion of the Haftara for Gen. v. 1, and it might have commenced with verse 8, since this is obviously connected with the first verse of the Torah reading. All authorities agree in attaching Isaiah liv. 9-10 as Haftara to Gen. vi. 9, since the Flood and Noah are expressly referred to in these verses. For viii. 1, there is Habak. iii. 1-5; the Aggada (*B. Sota*, 49a) gives as the reason for the coupling together of Habak. iii. 2 and Gen. viii. 1<sup>1</sup> that the remembrance of God is mentioned in both verses. Gen. viii. 15 is paired with Isaiah xlvi. 7-21; it is probable that the original Haftara was confined to vv. 7-9. Isaiah xlix. 9-13, is apportioned to ix. 18, this being determined by the first verse of the Pentateuch passage. The Massorah does not consider xi. 1 as a special Seder. It is, however, mentioned in this MS. as in the Yemen Grammar, the *Manuel du Lecteur*, since it was desired to read xv. 1 in all cases on Shabuoth, which was not always possible according to the Massoretic division of the Sedarim. Its Haftara is Zephaniah iii. 9-19 (cp. *Aboda Zara*, 24.)

Before we proceed any further it is necessary to notice the different statements of the Midrash. The Genesis Aggada cites Ezekiel xxxviii. 10 as the Haftara for Gen. v.; we, however, look in vain for its point of connection with the Seder. Yet if we remember that this Seder was read on Sabbath ח'ול המועד פסח, when also was recited the Messianic account contained in Ezekiel xxxviii., we are no longer ignorant of the reason why the Aggada took this Haftara. This same authority names Jer. xxxi. 20, as the portion for Gen. viii. 1. Our MS. gives a passage which owes its selection to the expression ויזכר which occurs in the first verse of the Torah Seder; the Haftara cited by the Aggada has a similar origin. We know it, indeed, as the Haftara for New Year, and as being occasioned by the word ויזכר in Gen. xxx. 22. Mic. vii. 9 is assigned to viii. 15, the expression יוציאני לאור being applied to the egress from the ark. If we compare this with the selection given by our MS. we find the same ideas conveyed by the latter; yet the subject of the Pentateuch Seder is more faithfully adhered to in Micah vii. 9, so that we may consider this as the older of the two. The Aggada proffers the same prophet passage as our MS. for ix. 8; we notice a similar agreement in several Sabbath readings quoted in the same source.

Let us now proceed with the investigation of the Haftaras in the MS. Joshua xxiv. 3-18 is coupled with xii. 1. The Karaites adopted the same passage, since they kept the first of the three Haftaras apportioned to the weekly Seder ל'ך ל'ך; the other rituals preferred Isaiah xl. 27, since they considered Gen. xiv. as the most important section of the Seder. The Massorah enumerates xii. 10 as a special Seder, which, however, is not sanctioned either by Meiri or the Manuel or our MS., all of which cite xiv. 1 as the portion immediately following xii. 1. The Haftara for this passage, according to our MS. is Isaiah xli. 2-14. It is identical with that accepted by the European Synagogues for this Seder; they,

however, commence some verses earlier, namely, xl. 27; the actual first verse is xli. 2, which contains a reference to Abraham's victory (cp. *Gen. Rabba*, cap. xlili.; *B. Sanhedrin*, 108). Isaiah i. 1-17 is annexed to xv. 1; there is no connection between these two from the point of view of similarity of context, since the prophet portion contains an earnest exhortation, whilst Gen. xv. describes the covenant between the pieces and the appearance of God. We might have supposed that this Haftara was introduced by the Karaites, were it not that, being quoted by the Genesis Aggada its Palestinian origin is indisputably proved. The single point of contact that exists between the two readings consists in the similarity of the expression מִזְחָה, which occurs in xv. 1 to the initial word of Isaiah i., namely, חַזְוֹן. This example clearly demonstrates that in the eighth century Haftaras were no longer selected on the basis of an analogous content, but merely on account of a likeness between the first significant expressions that occur in the Prophet and Pentateuch passages respectively. Isaiah lxiv. 1, is paired with xvi. 1, the word עֲקָרָה mentioned in both forming the bond between them. Isaiah lxv. 10, 11, is attached to xvii. 1; the solitary allusion to the Pentateuch reading is found in בְּרִית, which expression is also contained in the Haftara assigned to this Seder by the Genesis Aggada, namely, Jer. xxxiii. 25. The advantage rests decidedly with the latter, which mentions also Abraham. As in several instances, this case also establishes the truth that the more ancient Haftaras were never taken from Isaiah. In regard to the Haftara apportioned to xviii., we have again to remark an agreement between the Karaites and our MS. The former have Isaiah xxxiii. 17 to xxxiv. 12 and xxxv. 10; the MS. finishes the Haftara at xxxiv. 8. The Spanish and German Jews read in its stead 2 Kings iv., in which chapter verses 15 and 16 correspond to Gen. xviii. 10, and on account of its similarity of subject matter this portion might have very well served as the original

Haftara to this Seder. Isaiah xvii. 14 to xviii. 7 is the prophet selection for xix. 1 according to our MS., instead of which the Genesis Aggada cites Malachi iii. 18 and 19. Apart from the consideration that this latter has a similar context to the Seder, it has also to be accorded the preference over that derived from Isaiah, as a consequence of our previous investigation of the original sources of the Haftara. This same observation applies also to Isaiah lxi. 9, 10, which is the passage assigned by our MS. to xx. 1. (This Haftara, as may be seen, is introduced with the remark, <sup>1</sup> פָּסֹקְוּ פֶּקַת וְגִסְמֵו אֲשֶׁלֶת דְּשֻׁוּשָׁן which strengthens the conclusion derived from the Massoretic Seder beginning verse 10, that the Haftara consisted of only one verse.) In place of this Haftara, the Aggada names Judges ix. 22. This contains a reference to Abimelech, which is also the case with the Pentateuch reading. Even if these were two different persons, the subject-matter of the latter is more in conformity than is the content of the former to that of the Torah Seder. 1 Samuel ii. 21-28 is given as the Haftara for xxi. 1, which constitutes the reading for the New Year. We have already treated of this prophet section.

We have already pointed out that the selection of this Haftara for the New Year gave rise to the Aggada that it was on this day that Hannah was remembered by God in respect to her barren condition.

Isaiah xxxiii. 7-22 is the Haftara apportioned to xxii. 1. Instead of this, the Genesis Aggada cites Judges iii. 1, in which verse the word לְנָטוֹת occurs, thus establishing a connection with the first verse of the Torah Seder. The choice of this Haftara thus becomes intelligible to us. We cannot, however, offer a similar explanation for the

---

<sup>1</sup> According to this remark, the shortness of this Haftara is due to the fact that a verse follows which does duty as a prophet reading for another occasion. This was, indeed, also the case with Isaiah liv. 9, 10. Hence it is to be inferred that the repetition of passages which had been once read and which were required again was avoided.

selection of Isaiah xxxiii. 7-22. If, however, we take into consideration the Midrash which states that the angels wept when Abraham was about to slay his son, it is clear that this Haftara first came into vogue after this Aggadic statement became current, since the basis for its utterance is to be found in verse 7. The European Synagogues adopted 1 Kings i. 1 as the Haftara for xxiii. 1. The Karaites, however, selected the passage which is also accepted by our MS., namely, Isaiah li. 2. This verse has nothing in common with the Torah reading, except the names Abraham and Sarah. In addition to this circumstance, which makes for the superiority of the first-mentioned Haftara, this latter receives confirmation from the fact that the Genesis Aggada names the same section. Isaiah xii. 3—xiv. 2 is allotted to xxiv. 42,<sup>1</sup> a nexus being established on account of the similarity of the expressions **מעין חען** and **מעין**, which occur in the Torah and Prophet lessons respectively.

A second MS. (*Cat. Neubauer*, No. d, 41) cites Haftaras for a few Sedarim, commencing with Gen. xxv. 1. This document gives the Prophet portions *in extenso*, unlike our first MS., which mentions only the initial and final verses. Otherwise, with trifling exceptions, it offers nothing new on the subject.

The Haftara for Gen. xxv. 1 is in both MSS. 2 Sam. v. 13—vi. 1. The original portion probably consisted of only the first three verses. We look in vain for any connection between Isaiah lxv. 23—lxvi. 8 and the Torah Seder to which it is assigned, Gen. xxv. 19. Here, again, one expression gives the occasion for the choice. The following Haftara, Isaiah lxii. 8, coupled by our MS. with Gen. xxvi. 12, is not found in the second MS., as indeed

---

<sup>1</sup> We need not be surprised at the seeming length of this Haftara, for we must remember that the prophet portion was not necessarily read uninterruptedly till the concluding verse cited by the MS. The fact is that this verse was added after a few lines had been recited, so that the whole passage might finish with an auspicious context.

this Pentateuch Seder is mentioned neither by this document, nor the Massorah, nor Meiri, nor the Manuel. Here we have to record a remarkable fact, which requires a little attention. The Karaites, concerning whom we saw that they incorporated in their ritual the Haftara of the first Seder in the present weekly portion adopted Isaiah lxv. 23 as the Haftara to Gen. xxvi. 12, which section is not considered at all as a Pentateuch Seder by the above-quoted authorities. We further found, more than once, that the first words of the Torah reading gave rise to the selection of the Haftara. In accordance with this method, the first Haftara for Gen. xxvi. 12 was chosen on account of its containing a similar expression to וַיֹּצֶר, which forms the initial word of this verse. Thus both Haftaras seem to apply to this Seder. It is to be inferred then that Gen. xxv. 19 formed no new portion, but that the whole section, which extended from xxv. 1 to xxvi. 11, constituted one Pentateuchal lesson. This is proved also by the fact that the Karaites adopted for the whole weekly portion the Haftara of xxvi. 12, since this was the first Seder of the weekly portion, and they did not depart here from their usual practice. At the time when they borrowed their Haftaras from the Palestinians, Isaiah lxii. 8 was the accepted passage, whilst lxv. 23 represented another opinion. The first MS. gives Isaiah xlvi. 3 as the initial verse of the Haftara for xxvii. 1; the second, however, names verse 6 in its stead. The Torah reading confirms the selection of the former, since verse 3 is the only one that contains an appropriate allusion to Gen. xxvii., so that this deviation of the second MS. cannot really be justified.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport (*Erech Millin*, p. 167b.) on the basis of Gittin 60a, demonstrates that the teachers of the Talmudical period had a special book for the prophet portions containing Targum and Aggada. Accordingly we must believe that every Haftara had its exact limits. How was it then that the prophet portions gradually grew in extent? It has already been observed that, according to the account of our MS., verses which had been read once were found to be included in the Haftara for another Sabbath.

If, however, we assume that the Haftaras were read not from a book containing all the Haftaras consecutively, but from a complete copy of the book of each prophet, where the beginning of the portion was defined on the margin—sometimes with the name of the Torah Seder—and if we add to this that Isaiah xlvi. 3 according to our MS., and another fragment which gives three prophet readings *in extenso* (Catalogue Neubauer, No. b. 2, p. 14) formed the Haftara for Exod. xiii. 1, the difference of opinion becomes clear to us. It did not seem right to the author of the second MS., in whose prophet book the initial verses of the readings were marked, that one and the same verse should form the commencement of a Haftara for two different Sedarim. He could not do otherwise than apportion to one of the Sedarim a passage three verses in advance. Since verse 3 seemed more appropriate to Exod. xiii. 1, verse 6 was ascribed to Gen. xxvii., no consideration being taken of the fact that there is no point of contact between them.<sup>1</sup>

The passage for xxvii. 28 is Micah v. 7-13. In this and in several of the following Haftaras, we gain considerable

On the other hand we saw that the expression מפָנֶה was used several times to indicate that the further progress of the reading should be stopped. Hence it is to be concluded that the following verses were also before the reader of the Haftara—an inference which follows necessarily from the note to p. 24. We have already noticed above that in most ancient times the reading was made out of the prophetical book itself. Now, in order that the מפָנֶה should hit upon the suitable passage without much search, the commencement of an Haftara for a Sabbath Seder must have been marked on the margin. Since, then, the initial verses were so exactly described, there was no room for difference of opinion on this score; and, indeed, as we have already observed, these remained unchanged even in later times. The end of the prophet portion, however, was never given, hence arose numerous variations; some persons preferring to recite one verse, others 2, 10 and 21. It was left to the discretion of the reader to finish where he pleased, providing only that the concluding verse was not of an ominous nature. Thus it happened that verses which had already served as Haftara for one Sabbath appeared again in another Sabbath's portion.

<sup>1</sup> The old Haftara is retained by the Genesis Aggada; it is 1 Sam. ii. 22. The MS. Brit. Mus. Harl. 5,720 fixes Is. liv. 1 for the portion Gen. xxv. 19.

assistance from a third MS. (Cat. Neub., d. 42), which resembles the second in giving the whole portion, and differs from it in always adding a verse containing good tidings, even when the preceding verses rendered this unnecessary on account of its favourable subject-matter. Thus vi. 8 is joined on to the above-cited portion. The other rituals have Malachi i. as the Haftara for this weekly Seder. This section commences with the same idea as that contained in the above-mentioned Haftara, Isaiah xlvi. 3; it is, however, to be preferred to this latter, since it expressly names the two brothers, Esau and Jacob. We can also assume without further consideration that the Micah Haftara is the older of the two, since the Haftaras derived from Isaiah are of later introduction. This presumption becomes a complete certainty on noticing that the Genesis Aggada cites Micah v. 6 as the Haftara for xxvii. 28, and not the passage from Isaiah. The Haftara for the following weekly portion is another instance of the deviation of the Karaites from the practice of the European Synagogues; for the former adopted Hosea xi. 7, and the latter xii. 13. The three MSS. of the Palestinian cycle mention Hosea xii. 13 as the Haftara, since the Sabbath Seder commenced with Jacob's escape, and not with his employment by Laban. The Genesis Aggada is of the same mind, treating, as it does, this verse as the prophet portion for Gen. xxviii. 10.

The following Sabbath Seder, xxix. 31, is omitted by our MS. only through an oversight, since the Massora, Meiri, the Manuel and the two other sources consider it as a separate portion. Its Haftara is Isaiah lx. 15, instead of which the Aggada has 1 Sam. i. 1. Since this same authority names 1 Sam. i. 11 as the section for Gen. xxx. 21, it is possible to assume that in certain years the twenty-ninth chapter was reached on Rosh Hashana, and not the thirtieth. The Haftara for this festival, moreover, was 1 Sam. i.-ii. This was also read on it, when Gen. xxix. 31 was reached as Pentateuch lesson; hence

1 Samuel i. 1-10 was retained as Haftara for Genesis xxix. 31. Jeremiah xxx. 10-16 is given as the passage for xxxi. 3; our MS. has instead Micah vi. 3-vii. 20, which is in no way suitable to the Pentateuch Seder. It is possible that this was the Haftara for the day of Atonement, whose Torah lesson in the first year was Genesis xxxi. We have not yet justified the selection of the prophet reading, Hosea xi. 7, made by the Karaites and others; moreover, we encounter a difficulty in the third MS. which requires an explanation. Namely, it gives the questionable reading Hosea xi. 7 before proceeding to the following Seder, and names no Sabbath portion to which it is to be annexed. Since all authorities agree that xxxii. 4 follows immediately on xxxi. 3 without any intermediate Seder, this Haftara cannot be considered as belonging to a possible Seder between these two. Besides, this assigning of Haftaras without any corresponding Pentateuch Sedarim occurs three times in the same MS., so that the simple conclusion to be inferred is that several Sabbath Sedarim were invested with two different Haftaras. That generally accepted was placed with the rest, whilst that which was not usually adopted was mentioned at the end. The fact that there was already in Palestine a difference of opinion in respect to certain Haftaras explains why some Karaite collections cite the one, others the other prophet portion. This also gave rise to the controversy between the Spanish and German Jews over the Haftaras. Both were in vogue in Babylon, neither of them could be rejected altogether, so that there was room for two opinions. All the sources agree in attaching Obadiah 1 to Gen. xxxii. 4; the second MS., however, limits its extent to verses 1-7, to which verse 21 is added as a conclusion. The third MS. has another prophet reading after the Haftara to xxxv. 10, without a corresponding Torah Seder. This is Obadiah 8-21; only the initial letters of all the words in verses 1-7 are given, since this portion had already done duty as Haftara. We have

already remarked that this MS., by giving a second Haftara at the end of the recognised weekly portion, acquaints us with the practice of other congregations ; so that we have to notice a difference of custom here also, some communities reading only seven verses, others the whole book. I have still to remark that the Genesis Aggada mentions Obadiah as the Haftara. Nahum i. 12-ii. 5 is selected for xxxiii. 18, the word **שָׁלֹךְ** forming the bond of connection. Isaiah xlivi. 1-7 is coupled with xxxv. 9. The Karaites assign Isaiah xxxii. 18 to the whole of the following weekly portion. The MSS. name the same Haftara, limiting it to xxxiii. 6, to which verse 15 is added. Isaiah xxxvii. 31-37 is the portion for xxxviii. 1, Isaiah lii. 3-9 for xxxix. 1 ; other authorities make it extend to liii. 5. This is the passage already cited in the Tosefta as consisting of three verses which are not strictly related to each other. We gather from this example, as also from the majority of those hitherto considered, that when the Halachic and Midrashic writings cite the same Haftara as the MSS., it is very seldom a passage taken from Isaiah, whilst an overwhelming number are borrowed from the other prophets.

After the last-named the third MS. gives yet another Haftara without its Torah Seder, namely, Amos i. 3-15, whose initial verse is appropriate to none of the three Seders of the weekly portion. It is probable that verses 3-8 were afterwards placed before verse 9, which might have formed the original first verse, since it may be brought into connection with Gen. xl. 23. The European rituals adopt Amos ii. 6 as their Haftara, which verse is similar in context to the weekly portion, and is, moreover, explained by the Midrash as referring to the sale of Joseph. Instead of this the Aggada proffers Isaiah xl. 27, which also has application to the first Seder. If we wish to select the original of all these Haftaras, we must, as we have often emphasised, take the context as criterion. The more likeness there is between the Prophet and Pentateuch verses, the nearer does the former stand to the period of the introduction of

the Sabbath Haftaras. We must, therefore, supported also by the Boraitha and Tosefta, consider the passages assigned from Isaiah to Gen. xxxvii. 1 and xxxviii. 1, as of later origin, since there is only a literal and not a contextual similarity between the Seder and its Haftara. Those derived from Amos are older, since their subject-matter is analogous to that of their respective Torah readings. Between these two we place the prophet portion cited by the Genesis Aggada, as in all the cases hitherto dealt with, where this authority differs from the MS. The Karaites, as do also the MSS., name Isaiah xxix. 8-14 as the portion for xli. 1, a nexus being established by the expressions **יחלום** and **חלום** occurring in the two respectively.

The same sources give Isaiah xi. 2-9 as the Haftara for Gen. xli. 38; Isaiah l. 10, and lii. 11, for xlvi. 18. The Aggada names instead Isaiah xlix. 14, the choice of which is well justified by its contents. The MSS. assign Jer. xlvi. 12-17, xlvi. 12 to xlvi. 14. In the place of the Isaiah Haftara of the first Seder (which narrates the dream of Pharaoh) the European rituals have 1 Kings iii. 15. On the basis of the oft-confirmed assumption in respect to the sources of the oldest Haftaras, we are convinced that the latter is the more original passage. The third MS. declares as a matter of fact that 1 Kings iii. 15 was read as Haftara in many localities. This coincidence enables us to establish the truth that the deviations of the third MS. from the other two represent an older stage of the development, than do those Haftaras in which all three MSS. agree. Were this MS. more perfect than it really is, it would be possible through its instrumentality to show the progress from the old prophet portions cited by the Midrash, and Yemenian, German and Spanish Jews to those enumerated in the MSS. Perhaps it would be possible also to discover the date of the change. I have yet to add to those Haftaras of this weekly portion already mentioned that of the Aggada, Jer. ii. 4, which belongs to xlvi. 14. To xliv. 18, Joshua xiv. 6

is apportioned both by the Karaites and the MSS. This selection does not in the least depend upon similarity of subject-matter, but is chosen on account of its first word; Ezek. xxxvii. 16, which is found in the other rituals, is more adequately fitting to the Torah Seder. The prophet reading for the following Pentateuchal passage is an instructive example of the opposition which is manifest between the Haftaras of the MSS. and those of the other rituals. We found above that the prophet portion assigned by the Pesikta Rabbati to Chanucca is really the Haftara for Gen. xlvi. 28, to which it is in fact ascribed by the Genesis Aggada; it corresponds to the contents of the Torah section to which it belongs. The Haftara, however, which is apportioned by the MSS. to the same Seder, Zach. x. 6-11, is only connected with it in that it contains a reference to the tribe of Judah whose ancestor is mentioned in the commencement of the Torah passage. The contributions to this subject made by the two last-quoted MSS. cease with this Haftara, so that we must apply ourselves solely to the consideration of the contents of the first MS. We find here 2 Kings xiii. 14 attached to xlviii. 1, which is also the Karaite Haftara; the other rituals, however, have 1 Kings ii. 1. Isaiah xliii. 2 is paired with xlix. 1, this Isaiah verse being also considered by the Midrash as a reproach against Jacob in the matter of the blessing. (*Vide* Midrash Tanchuma to the passage.)

Zachariah xiv. 1, is coupled with xlix. 27. The passage cited by the Genesis Aggada, Micah ii. 12, is far more appropriate to the preceding Seder than is Isaiah xliii. 2, since it is applicable to the simple sense of the first verse, and not to the Midrashic explanation of the same. The MS. of the Genesis Aggada (*Cat. Neub.* No. 2,340) has Isaiah xlviii. 12 instead, of which a trace is found also in the editions. The idea which this Haftara, as also that to xxii. 12, suggests, is that many of the prophet readings cited in our MS. were first selected in

conformity with the Midrashic interpretation of these passages, since they often bear not even the slightest allusion to the Sabbath reading.

We have now arrived at the end of Genesis; if we make a retrospect of the prophet portions enumerated, we notice that out of forty-five, not less than twenty-nine are derived from Isaiah, seven from the Minor Prophets, six from the historical writings, and only two from the later prophetical books Jeremiah and Ezekiel.<sup>1</sup> I deem it necessary to call attention to these numbers, as they will soon be fraught with the greatest importance for us.

Proceeding with the Haftaras of our MS., we find Isaiah xxvii. 6 apportioned as in all rituals to Exod. i. 1. The Aggada which gave us a series of Haftaras confirming those of our MS., and also some new prophet portions, confines its contributions to Genesis, so that the certainty as to which were the old Haftaras of the other books of the Pentateuch becomes materially weakened. Yet we have to notice here a few variations found in other sources, which require some attention as they are important. The MS. of the Bodleian (*Cat. Neub.* No. 6), that of the British Museum (Or. 2,451 p. 214 ff.) which contains the Persian ritual, and the Yemen MS. of the Bodleian agree in many Haftaras in which they deviate from the other rituals. The first names Jeremiah i. 1 as the Haftara for Exod. i.,

<sup>1</sup> I herewith supply the Haftaras for Gen. i. 1 and ii. 4, which are missing in our MS., since all the sources, apart from a few verses added to the end, cite Isaiah xlvi. 5, and only the Karaites have Isaiah xlvi. 17 seq., and then skipping the intermediate chapters, lxvi. 13. This latter choice is clearly derived from the triennial cycle; it tells of the creation, and belongs to the first Seder, whilst the other may be assigned to the second Seder. Isaiah xlvi. 8, on the basis of the Tanchuma, or Jeremiah xxii. 30, according to the Aggada, may be coupled with iii. 24. The Tanchuma remarks (vide *Yalkut* to Isaiah xlvi. 8), **אָנָי ה' הוּא שְׁמִי לֹא אָדָם הַרְשָׁוֹן**. The context however seems to suggest Isaiah xlvi. 27 as a possible Haftara for iii. 24, since it refers to the sin of the first man.

the second gives Ezekiel xvi. 1, the third Ezekiel xx. A MS. (*Cat. Neub.*, No. e. 31) also cites Ezekiel xvi. 1 as the Haftara to Exodus i. 1. This prophet portion will be recognised that which R. Eliezer would not allow to be read in public (*Megilla* IV. 10). This passage is called **חוכחה ירושלים** and **פרשת הוכחה** (*B. Shabb.* 129), and when it was admitted into the Synagogue it was explained as referring to the idolatry and lawlessness of the Israelites in Egypt (vide *Yalkut*). The fact that a Tanna had interdicted its reading in the synagogue had this consequence: it was gradually allowed to lapse, in spite of the permission granted in the Talmud, and in place of it was substituted Ezek. xx., which contained the same reproach, but couched in less harsh language. We have already mentioned this passage as the Haftara for Lev. xviii.<sup>1</sup> This also disappeared from the practice of the Synagogue, and since a **חוכחה** was required, Jeremiah i. 1 was selected.

Let us now return to our MS. embodying the Palestinian ritual. In this document Isaiah xl. 11 is attached to Exod. iii. 1, and Isaiah lv. 12 to Exod. iv. 18. For the first Seder of the following weekly section the Karaite Haftara is identical with that cited by our MS., namely Isaiah xlvi. 8, whereas the European rituals and the Yemenian MSS. have in its stead Ezekiel xxviii. 25. This Haftara really commenced with verse 29, some verses being added to the old reading. It is hardly necessary to state that this latter holds the claim for priority. Joel iii. 3 is annexed to vii. 18,

---

<sup>1</sup> This chapter treats of the forbidden marriages between blood relations, and therefore Ezek. xvi. would have been peculiarly appropriate to it. It is possible also that this was really the portion for Lev. xviii., since we see that it was supplanted by Ezek. xx., which portion is assigned to Jacob b. Yehuda in his **מגילה ע"ו**. The Haftara of the German Jews confirms this conjecture; for Amos ix. 7 like Ezek. xvi., treats of the origin of the Israelites, but it is in a gentle, not in such a drastic manner. This would represent the third stage in the development, as would also the substitution of Jer. i. for Ezek. xx. in the case of Exod. i. 1, inasmuch as the remonstrance is mildest in these chapters.

and Isaiah xxxiv. 11 to viii. 16. The following Haftara is of special interest. Since this is apportioned to the first division of the weekly portion, we should be justified in expecting that the Karaites would have selected this same prophet passage, since this was their usual practice, as is undoubtedly proved by our investigation of the Haftaras for the whole book of Genesis. Instead of this reading they have Isaiah xxxiv. 11 as the prophet lesson for the weekly portion בָּאָה, which commences with chap. x. We have already seen that our MS. pairs this passage with the last Seder of the previous weekly portion. How is this seeming inconsistency on the part of the Karaites to be explained, for which we find no analogy in the choice of the Haftaras already considered? Yet in one solitary case we met with an exception, namely in reference to Gen. xxvi.; this brought us to the conclusion that the weekly portion of the Karaites commenced with that Seder, and that they chose a Haftara suitable to the whole section. Shall we offer a similar solution to our present difficulty and assume that the weekly portion originally began with Exod. viii. 16, and not with x. 1?

If the selection of the Karaites is to be justified at all, it must be on such a basis, and we are accordingly confronted with the fact that the weekly divisions were still in a state of flux in the eighth century, or that they deviated from the partition in vogue at the present day. Seeing, however, that the Karaite sources are not always trustworthy when they display any variation from the Rabbanite practices, we cannot rely on this solitary account to settle the matter. Let us, therefore, examine some contemporaneous authorities. The *Halachoth Gedoloth* (p. 617), *Halachoth Kesuboth* (p. 38), and *Halachoth Pesukoth* (p. 132) name Exod. xii. 14-51 as the Passover lesson, and since the division of the Pentateuch into chapters did not yet exist, it was necessary to cite the weekly portion, and this is mentioned as בְּקָרֶת הַשְׁלָמָה and not as בָּאָה; consequently both these works considered Exod. viii. 16 as

the commencement of the weekly portion. Again, we find a similar account in a fragment emanating from Egypt (*Catalogue Neubauer*, No. e. 45, p. 6b) which reads as follows:

בִּימָא קְדֻמָּה דְּפִיסָּה דְּנִיסָּן קָרְוָה בְּסִפְרַיָּה—  
בְּפִרְשָׁתָא דְּהַשְׁכָם בְּבָקָר מֵן וְהֵיה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה לְכָרְוִין וְעַד קָרְשׁ לֵי

Moreover, there is extant a portion of the liturgy specially assigned to this portion, a fragment (*Catalogue Neubauer*, No. f, 38, p. 5) citing יְצֵר הַשְׁכָם לְמַחְלָאָן וְאֶרְאָה between a prayer peculiar to and one appropriate for גִּזְהָי בְּשַׁלְחָן.<sup>1</sup> (Cp. Neub. in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, xiv. p. 107, and Ginsburg *Massorah* ፲ 401.)

Let us return again to the Haftara of Exod. x. 1. The Yemenian and South Italian authorities (*Cat. Neub.*, No. 6) assign Isaiah xix. to this Pentateuchal lesson, the Germans Jerem. xlvi., neither of these being found in our MS., which has instead 1 Sam. vi. 6 for x. 1, and Isaiah xxi. 11 for xii. 29. This is the first time that the MS. prefers an extra-Isaiah Haftara—namely, one selected from the historical works—when other rituals derive theirs from that Prophet. It is probable, then, that this was an old prophet reading which was not supplanted by an Isaiah passage for this reason: in addition to its contextual likeness to its Torah section, the first verse contains a similar expression to one which occurs in the initial verse of the Pentateuch Seder; and this, as we saw, prompted the choice of Haftaras in later times. Moreover, as a matter of fact, 1 Sam. vi. 6 is not only an allusion to, but is a repetition of the context of Exod. x., so that its selection is more justifiable than other Haftaras which contain only a bare reference to the contents of the Torah Seder. We should have expected, as regards the portion for Exod. xii. 29, which commences

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the arrangement of the Siddur בְּנֵי נְאָר was already considered as the beginning of the weekly portion, for after this piece there follows immediately one thus superscribed בּוֹא אֶל פְּרֻעה לְרַבְנָנו שְׁמוֹאֵל, the compiler being of opinion that the Yozer of Sahlan applied to another week. It is possible that the old division was retained in Egypt.

an old Pesach reading, the Haftara originally chosen, on account of its connection with this festival, and already mentioned in the Boraitha ; this was, however, allowed to lapse, an Isaiah passage being selected in its stead. The prophet lesson for xiii. 1 is Isaiah xlvi. 3, which is headed by the phrase פסוקין פקח. The signification of this remark is that another Haftara begins with verse 5. For the following Seder the Karaites have again preserved an old Haftara, Joshua xxiv. 7, which contains a direct allusion to the Torah section ; all other sources have instead Judges v. 1 (Song of Deborah).<sup>1</sup> This difference of opinion is of ancient date, its basis being given above. Our MS. cites Isaiah lxv. 24, which has no reference to the actual contents of the Pentateuch Seder. There also we find Isaiah lviii. 23 named as Haftara for Exod. xvi. 28. The Seder following xv. 21, which exists in the division of the Massora, Meiri, and the Manuel, is missing in our MS. ; this can only be the result of an oversight, though, indeed, this is not an isolated instance of such an omission. Its Haftara was probably Isaiah xlix. 10. The Karaites pair Isaiah xxxiv. 13 with xviii. 1, whilst other rituals adopt Isaiah vi. in accordance with the context of the following Seder, which Haftara really originated from its connection with Shabuoth, on which occasion this Torah portion was recited. Isaiah lxi. 6-10 is the passage proffered by our MS. for this Seder, selected on account of similarity of expressions occurring in the initial verses. Isaiah lvi. 1 is coupled in our MS. with xxi. 1 ; this is also the Karaite Haftara, the others preferring Jerem. xxxiv. 1. The first

---

<sup>1</sup> Since this Haftara was originally apportioned to the first day of Pesach, and was only at a later date carried over to the Seder itself, we should expect that the Song of Deborah, which is read by many congregations as Haftara for the Sabbath portion, should have been analogously transferred from the festival to Exod. xiv. In reality we find in *Cat. Neub.*, No. d, 3, a MS. which otherwise follows the Karaitic Ritual, that Judges v. was the Haftara for the eighth day of Pesach.

verse of the Haftara for xxii. 24 has been omitted in the MS.; its conclusion is Is. xl ix. 3; Is. lx. 17-lxi. 9 is paired with xxv.; Is. lxvi. 1-11 with xxvi. 1; and Ezek. xvi. 10-19 with xxvi. 31. This latter Haftara is taken from that portion the reading of which in public was prohibited by R. Eliezer. It is surprising that whilst verses 1-9 on account of their subject-matter were excluded from the synagogue, these latter verses are retained by our document, which otherwise does not display any preponderating inclination for this prophet.

We have already suggested that many of the Haftaras cited by our MS. were originally selected on account of a Midrashic connection set up between the prophet portions and their respective Pentateuch passages. It has been remarked above that when this chapter was admitted into the Divine service, it was explained allegorically, verses 10-19 being interpreted to refer to the building of the Tabernacle. The Jonathan Targum gives a similar paraphrase. We now understand how it was that these verses did duty as the Haftara for Exod. xxv. 31, in which passage the individual parts of the Tabernacle are described. The European rituals selected 1 Kings v., which gives an account of the construction of King Solomon's Temple. Exod. xxvii. 20 gave occasion for various views. The Karaites cite Jer. xi., our MS. Hosea xiv. 7, the Spanish and German rituals name a third in Ezekiel xl iii. 10, which latter is most suited to the whole contents of the Seder. Isaiah lxi. 6 is assigned to Exod. xxix. 1; Malachi i. 11-ii. 7 to xxx. 1; Isaiah xl iii. 7-21 to xxxi. 1. The Karaites have the same Haftara. 2 Sam. xxii. 10-51 is assigned to Exod. xxxii. 15; Jer. xxxi. 33-40 to xxxiv. 27. For the whole weekly portion the Persian and European rituals selected 1 Kings xviii. 27-39, considering that passage of the portion the most important which describes the incident of the Golden Calf. 1 Kings viii. 8-22 is apportioned to xxxvii. 1; Jer. xxx. 18-xxxii. 9 to xxxviii. 21. This latter selection is only intelligible if

we take into consideration the translation of אַרְמֹן by Jonathan and the corresponding Midrash passage, both of which render this word by "Temple." This is yet another proof that many of the selections imply a Midrashic interpretation of the Scriptural portions in question. Our MS. gives Isaiah xxxiii. 20-xxxiv. 8 as the Haftara for Exod. xxxix., whilst of the other sources some name 1 Kings vii. 13 and some 1 Kings vii. 50. We must add that the MS., which, without being of Karaite origin, cites Karaite Haftaras (*Catalogue Neubauer*, No. d, 3), names 1 Kings vii. 27 as the prophet passage for xxxviii. 21; so that, irrespective of its appropriate context, additional testimony is afforded for the presumption that this Haftara was in vogue amongst the Karaites.

Summing up the prophet readings for the twenty-nine Sedarim of the Book of Exodus, we find eighteen derived in this MS. from Isaiah, three from Jeremiah, four from the minor prophets, three from the historical works, and one from Ezekiel, whilst some of the older Haftaras were cited by the other sources. The general result arrived at from the consideration of these Haftaras is that the Isaiah passages were undoubtedly preceded by others, and that many of these later introduced portions were selected on a basis of the Midrash rather than of the contents of the Pentateuch lesson. In order to complete the contents of our authority, we have still to enumerate the Haftaras assigned by it to four Sabbath readings. Micah vi. 9-vii. 8 is paired with Levit. i., the Midrash cites instead Jerem. xxxi. 19; Ezek. xviii. 4-17, with Levit. iv. 1. We shall have occasion to speak of this Haftara as the portion selected for the Sabbath between New Year and the day of Atonement. Zach. v. 3-vi. 14 is attached to Lev. v. 1, and Malachi iii. 4 to vi. 12. The Karaites and all other rituals have Isaiah xlivi. 21 as the Haftara for the first weekly portion of Leviticus. We have here again to recount the fact that in this instance the Karaites make a thorough deviation from the account of the MS., and especially that they derive

their passage from Isaiah, whilst the latter selects its reading from another prophetical work.

We must add that the European synagogues, in common with the Yemenian and Persian, adopted the same Haftara as the Karaites, and besides this sufficiently confirming circumstance, the context bears testimony in favour of Isaiah xlivi. 21. On the other hand, we found that the Haftara named in the MS. has already been mentioned by it as the reading from the Prophets for Gen. xxxi. The choice of this Haftara, on account of its utter want of similarity to the Torah Seder, led us to the assumption that it was probably the prophet passage for the day of Atonement or Sabbath Shuba. Now we know that in the second year of the cycle, Levit. v. was recited on this very Sabbath ; hence the selection of this seemingly anomalous Haftara is justified. The Karaites who found this Haftara assigned to Lev. v. 1 could not adopt it for the whole portion, since it was fixed for a special occasion. They accordingly chose another, which, like the two Haftaras accepted in the MS. to Gen. xxxviii., was in vogue amongst the Palestinians. We must not be prevented by the fact that it is taken out of the book of Isaiah from assuming that it is an old prophet reading. We found Isaiah lii. 3, 4, 5 mentioned expressly in the Tosefta, and x. 32 in the Boraitha.

The Talmud (*J. Meg.* iv. 9) cites Isaiah xlvi. 9 as an example of a short Haftara. This portion, from the point of view of context, belongs to Num. xiv., or on the basis of the Midrash to Numbers xi. (v. *Yalkut* to Is. xlix. 9). The Talmud (*B. Megilla* 24b) further informs us that R. Chiyya said to Simon b. Rabbi that he (Simon) was incapacitated by his deep voice from reciting the priestly blessings. On Simon repeating this to his father, the latter remarked that if R. Chiyya should read Isaiah viii. 17 he would blaspheme God. Since this narrative speaks of the loud reading in the synagogue it is clear that this last-mentioned passage has to be considered as a Haftara, whose

Pentateuch Seder cannot be determined, since it is not known what was the initial verse of the prophet reading, and it was always on this verse that the choice of the Haftara depended. Further, we have the passage Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, cited by Luke (iv. 16), which, judging from its subject-matter, might have very well served as the prophet portion for Deut. xv. 7.

The question however cannot yet be answered, Why were these Haftaras selected from Isaiah at the stage of the development represented by our MS.? We have to investigate another series of prophet readings selected from the book of Isaiah. It is well known that both Pesiktas assign as Haftaras to the seven Sabbaths between the 10th of Ab and the 1st of Tishri, passages derived from Isaiah. The question is, Whence did these originate? For since these are treated as special portions and as if for extraordinary Sabbaths, and are placed in the Pesiktas in line with the Haftaras for the festivals and the four extraordinary Parashas, it seems that the motive prompting their selection was not that generally adopted in the choice of Haftaras. In the Pesiktas we find three other Haftaras which were instituted for the three Sabbaths immediately preceding the 9th of Ab. We shall presently learn not only that these latter are dependent on the former, but that they both have a common origin. Rab it was who first introduced prophet portions for the Sabbaths before the 9th of Ab that had no contextual contact with their respective Torah Sedarim. We have already seen that this Rabbi was responsible for many of the Sedarim and Haftaras. He returned from Palestine to his native land Babylon about the year 210, and bestowed especial attention to the Sabbath and festival lessons. In the passage (*B. Meg.* 31a), where the Pentateuch and Prophet portions are enumerated in a Boraitha in Rab's name,<sup>1</sup> Rab Huna on Rab's authority

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Talmud it seems as if R. Huna himself was the selector of this Haftara. A response of the Geonim, however, which deals with this

cites Isaiah i. 14 as the Haftara for the 1st of Ab when it falls on Sabbath. We can assume with some degree of certainty that Rab, as in the case of the other readings, also brought this with him from Palestine. Since, however, in consequence of the triennial division of the Law in vogue in Palestine, a different Torah section was read on the Sabbath of the 1st of Ab every year of the cycle, it is clear that the Haftara had no connection with these Seders, but was chosen on account of its suitability to the import of the month in which occurred the 9th of Ab—the memorial of the destruction of Jerusalem. R. Huna names Isaiah i. 21, as the portion for the 9th of Ab. Since, however, in those times Haftaras were only recited on Sabbaths and festivals, this could only have applied to the case when the 9th of Ab fell on Sabbath although indeed it is actually assigned to this occasion in general, even when it happens on a week day<sup>1</sup> (vide *Megilla* 31b).

Since this passage only cites the two above-mentioned Haftaras, we see that Rab's introduction applied only to those exceptional cases where either the 1st or 9th of Ab falls on Sabbath. Both days, however, could not coincide with Sabbaths in the same year; it is, indeed, more often that both should be week-days; we are therefore bound to assume that only one, or in some cases neither of these Haftaras was read, the Haftara for the weekly Seder being recited instead. Yet it is possible that the custom soon arose of reading both these prophet passages cited above on the first and second Sabbaths in Ab, since

---

prophet section (Müller in *Beth Talmud* iv., p. 317, and Harkavy *Responsen der Gaonim*, p. 9) contains the following passage וְשִׁשָּׁלְתָהּ מֵאָדָם which proves indisputably that Rab instituted this special prophet portion.

<sup>1</sup> The above-mentioned response apportions this verse to the Sabbath before the 9th of Ab, whence it may be concluded that it was arranged to be read on the Sabbath. On the other hand, the Amora who adds to this a remark introduced by the expression וְהַא יָדַנָה, applies this Haftara to all cases of the 9th of Ab.

both give expression to thoughts which should be aroused in the minds of the people during this month (*Taanith* iv. 6). Once it was established that on the two Sabbaths preceding the day of affliction passages should be read containing words of censure and exhortation which allude to future punishment—on which account these Haftaras afterwards received the appellation of דְּפָרָעָנָה אֶת—*it was also decided, by way of compensation, to recite in the two Sabbaths immediately following the ninth of Ab such portions as promised comfort and consolation, and which were therefore called נְחַמָּה*. The Babylonian Talmud makes no mention of these latter, so that it seems that they were unknown in Babylon. They originated, therefore, in Palestine, and were a result of a further development of the punishment Haftaras. It was from this source that the Karaites derived them. Both consolation passages were borrowed from Isaiah, this book being described as containing words of comfort (*Berachoth*, 57b). The portions were xl. 1 and li. 12, where the expression נְחַם is explicitly mentioned. It does not seem, however, as if these four unusual portions were allowed to remain as isolated instances for very long. The 17th day of Tammuz is also a fast day, and commemorates the first breach made in the walls of Jerusalem, and the three weeks transpiring between this fast and that of the ninth of Ab were considered as days of mourning. It was only natural, then, that a punishment portion taken from the prophets should be assigned also to the Sabbath following the 17th of Tammuz, so that three such were read on three consecutive Sabbaths. This brought about also the selection of a third consolation Haftara, so that the six Sabbaths ensuing between the 17th of Tammuz and the end of Ab were supplied with extraordinary prophet passages. Maimonides (*Tefilla* xiii. 19) knows only of one comfort passage as the old custom; the Yemenian, South Italian, and partly the Karaite rituals also only mentioned one. The additional Nechama portion mentioned above was

most likely Isaiah liv. 2, where the word נחם occurs. Nor did the usage remain stationary at this second stage of the development. There will still be four Sabbaths before the New Year, which had a special signification on account of this festival. To these days were also assigned Haftaras containing words of hope and good courage, so that there were seven such, whilst the number of retribution readings remained unaltered, since there was no ground for any change. It cannot be accurately determined whether these were not the result of a gradual growth, since we shall see that the Midrash Tanchuma cites only six. Both Pesiktas have the full number of the special sections before New Year which were also in vogue among the Karaites.

Let us now examine the prophet portions assigned to these ten Sabbaths. As already mentioned, Rab named Isaiah i. 14<sup>1</sup> as the Haftara for the first of Ab happening on a Sabbath. This was, however, soon supplanted by another passage. For although the first mentioned is found in Maimonides, and also in the Yemenian and Persian rituals which followed his lead, yet we see that Isaiah xxii. 1 is cited by other Yemenian authors, which, on account of its fourth verse, was eminently suitable for the month of Ab. The majority of the congregations of Yemen did not know of any consolation Haftaras at all. Salomon b. Nathan (*Cat. Neub.*, No. 896, p. 195b) informs us that the unusual Haftaras of these Sabbaths were looked upon as an accepted custom, but not as a binding practice. He makes the following statement: ופי אלכבה ב' והוי סבָת—שמעו יקיא פִי בעצ' אלבלאָד שמעו דבר יי' בית יעקב בירמיה ופי גירחה יקרא משא גיא חזון בישעה.

We find here a third Haftara apportioned to the first

---

<sup>1</sup> The originally introduced Haftara commenced with this verse, and not, as many think that it had already begun in ancient times, with v. 1. The Responsum of the Geonim makes it extend to v. 19, others to ii. 5. It is possible, however, that this latter verse was affixed merely to insure a propitious conclusion.

Sabbath of Ab, namely, Jerem. ii. 4, which both Pesiktas and all later sources also adopt.<sup>1</sup> The fact that all deviate from the Babylonian Talmud demonstrates that this custom really sprang from Palestine, and developed outside Babylon. R. Huna gave Isaiah i. 21 as the portion for the second Sabbath in the month of Ab, so that by means of the initial word אֶלְכָה allusion might be made to the Lamentations of Jeremiah. This Haftara is named by the forementioned Salomon b. Nathan, and also by Maimonides who is at one in this respect with the Pesikta, and with the Persian ritual. The first authority, however, mentions Jer. li. 50 as another opinion. We do not meet with this Haftara elsewhere, and it therefore stands in need of further explanation. Moreover, the Pesikta Rabbati gives rise to a further difficulty, in that it considers Jerem. xxxvii. 1, 2 as Haftara for the second Sabbath in Ab. Friedman attempts to justify this latter selection, on the ground that Jeremiah alone was looked upon as the censor, and that, therefore, this passage was chosen from Jeremiah in place of the Isaiah reading. This view seems to receive endorsement from the Responsum given in a note above, and from a MS. (*Cat. Neub.*, No. 294), since they as well as the Yemenian Midrash, *Brit. Mus. Or.* 1422, cite as the Haftara for this Sabbath Jerem. vi. 16, and Jerem. vi. 17 respectively. Salomon b. Nathan gives Jerem. li. 50 also as Haftara for the Sabbath immediately succeeding the 17th of Tammuz. Yet why should just these sections be taken from Jeremiah, and what was the cause of this great divergence of opinion? Since we assumed that these prophet portions developed in Palestine, they can only be explained from the point of view of a triennial cycle. If we examine Jerem. xxxvii. 12, we find no allusion in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Englishman, Jakob b. Jehuda, also remarks in עץ חיים, p. 45—  
וְאֵב שַׁחַל בְשִׁבְתַּת מִצְרַיִם חֲדִשִּׁיכֶם וּמוֹעֲדֵיכֶם שְׁנָאָה נְפָשִׁי וְאֵין מְנֻהָנוּ כֵן  
אַלְאָ שְׁמַעוּ דְבָרַ הָיָה. It seems from this passage that he applies this Haftara only to such a case when the 1st of Ab falls on Sabbath.

simple text to the fast day of the 9th of Ab. If, however, we take into consideration the Midrash (*v.* Echa Rab. xxviii., and Yalkut) which informs us that xxxvi. 32 refers to the Lamentations, we arrive at the conclusion that the Haftara commenced with this verse, and that it is imperfectly preserved in the Pesikta. The choice of this verse for the 9th of Ab is thus justified on the ground that it treats of the mourning for the destruction of Jerusalem.

Let us further consider the Sabbath after the 17th of Tammuz. Both Pesiktas name Isaiah i. 1, this Haftara being unanimously recognised by all sources in which any mention of punishment portions is to be found. The Pesikta Rabbati prefixes to this a discussion based on Ezek. xxxiv., which implies a fourth Sabbath דפּוֹרָעַנְוָרָה. How is this conceivable, seeing that between the 17th of Tammuz and the 9th of Ab, there can only be three Sabbaths. Let us return for a moment to the oldest authority on these Sabbaths, namely, R. Huna (*Megilla*, 31b). His remarks apply only to the case when the 9th of Ab fell on a Sabbath, which carries with it the necessary consequence that the 17th of Tammuz was also a Sabbath. It was deemed desirable to fix a special Haftara for such a Sabbath; this was the portion cited in the Pesikta. The others do not recognise this Sabbath as one of the extraordinary days, and give only three unusual readings. Yet why Ezek. xxxiv.? By looking over the Haftaras of the triennial cycle, treated above in detail, we find that this passage is assigned to Levit. xxvi., and Jerem. i. 1 to Exodus i. 1, by the Yemenian MSS. and Midrash, *Brit. Mus. Or.* 1422, Salomon b. Nathan, and the South Italian and Persian rituals. Is there then any connection between this Sabbath and the Pentateuch Seder just quoted? We found above (p. 433) that in most cases the Torah reading was finished in Palestine about the 7th of Adar, and began afresh about the 1st of Nissan; according to R. Eliezer,

the Torah was finished on the second Sabbath of Shebat. It was surprising to us that both these occasions should be regarded by the Mishna (*Rosh Hash.*, I. 1) as New Year days; and we suggested that this was probably connected with the different customs in vogue in different schools as to the date on which the reading of the Law was commenced. If this conjecture is correct, then there must have been many congregations which started the Pentateuchal lessons on the 1st of Elul, since this day is also described by the Mishna as a New Year. Following out a division of the Sedarim on this latter basis, we find that Levit. xxvi. falls on the Sabbath of the 17th of Tammuz; and we now perceive what was the origin of the Haftara of the Pesikta; it was the ordinary prophet reading for that particular Pentateuchal passage.<sup>1</sup>

This happened in the second year of the cycle based on the supposition that the first of Elul was the starting point; in the first year Exodus i. 1 was reached on Sabbath 17th of Tammuz, whose Haftara, Jer. i. 1, we find in reality assigned by all sources to this Sabbath. In the third year Deut. xxviii. formed the Pentateuchal portion, for which the Haftara in question, Jeremiah li. or Isaiah i. did duty; both these are moreover enumerated in the series of punishment readings. There exists a number of remarks in the Midrash which clearly imply such a division of the Sedarim, the consideration of which, however, would lead us too far. We must notice, however, a striking fact, which is the outcome of this partition of the Pentateuchal portions.

If, as a matter of fact, those exhortatory passages cited in the later sources are the Haftaras of three Sabbaths in three different years, then in Palestine there could only have been one such Sabbath every year, since there were

---

<sup>1</sup> The Karaites have Isaiah i. 19 for this portion, and, in fact, this is included among the פורענות נא.

no other punishment portions. As a matter of fact Rab, who came from Palestine, informs us that an unusual Haftara was recited there only when either the 1st or 9th of Ab fell on a Sabbath. In this way the opinion suggested by the triennial cycle receives additional confirmation. A second conclusion necessarily follows from the foregoing. If the Haftaras before the 9th of Ab were derived from the three different years, this must also have been the case with the consolation portions, and therefore only one Sabbath could have been devoted to this purpose. Should, however, the examination of the passages themselves not establish such an inference, I shall add here the account of the author in the Haftara collection of the Persian ritual (*Brit. Mus. Or.* No. 2451, p. 288b), for which my thanks are due to Mr. Schechter, of Cambridge. It reads as follows:—

אילו הן סימני הפטורות מ"ז בחמוץ עד סוף החומש וסימני דשח נועל ארליך שושן ואלו הן . דברי ירמיה . שמעו . חזון ישעיהו . נחמו . ותאמר ציון . עניה טורה . אגסי אנסי . רני עקרה . קומי אוורי . שובה . דרשׁו . שוש אשיש . וכן אנו עוסין מן החכפר' הלו סימן לפי שאין משנינו אותן מסדרן וכמו שאנו אמרין אותן בשנה זו כך אנו לאמן בכל שנה ג' הפטורות הראשונות שהן דברי תוכחה אום' אותן מ"ז בחמוץ עד תשעה באב שיש ביןיהם ג' שבתות לעולם והאחרונות שכולן נהמות אום' אותן אחר ט' באב עד יום הכפורים . וכן דרך מנהמין לנחים מעט שהוא אומר לנחרב נחמה יותר מدائיכן לאומר למחזר פתחים למחזר אהת מלך אינו מאיזן מיד שנ' ולא שמעו אל משה מקוצר רוח לפיכך תחליה נהמו ואחכ' ותאמר וגו' כלומר אעפ' שנחרב אל האמר נזובתי ואחר כך עניה טורה לפיכך הקדימוהו לאגסי אנסי הוא מנהמכם מאחר שנחמה ה'ק'ב'ה בחסדייו שוב אינו קוראה לא נחמה ועד עכשו ניחומה של נביאים מיכן ואילך הוא מנהמה ואחר שקבלת התנומין פסק לה כמה טוב' ונגדותה הן רני עקרה קומי אוורי שוש אשיש . וכן אמר הרבה הנערב אור מורה ונר מערב החכם ה"ה הרב הגדול שיזכהו חמייד עלי כמנadol לר' משה ביר' מיזון זיל' בספרו הטוב ספר אהבה בהיל' תפלת וברכת כהנים בפרק י"ג מנהג פשוט בערינו להיות מפטרין נהמות ישעה מאחר ט'

באב עד ראש השנה ושבת שבין ר'ה לוה"כ מפטירין שובה .  
ובשעה שראיתי בעינוי אילו הדברות התחלתי לברוב אילן שש  
ההפטירות ולסדר מעתה ואילך לקרות בעזורת אל יוצר המאורות .  
או"ר יס"ט וס"ז .

He asserts with especial stress that the order of the consolation Haftaras for the next year should be the same as in this. He was perfectly aware of the various arrangements of these prophet readings, which, being derived from many years, did not always fall into the same succession ; indeed, the portions themselves were different, as we shall soon see. I start from the remark of the Midrash Tanchuma (Deut. i.) which gives an account of the *נחמה* passages. It says:—*כל נחמות שאמר ישועה כפליים הם לפyi*:—*שלקחה מיד כי כפליים בכל חטאיה לפיכך ניחומיים בלשון כפליים נחמו עמי . אני אנסי הוא מנחמכם . עורי עורי . התעוררי התעוררי . שוש אשיש . פרוחה הפרה והתגל*.

Thus six portions are mentioned, xl. 1 ; li. 12 ; li. 9 ; li. 17 ; lxi. 10 ; xxxv. 1, all of which have this in common, that they repeat the first word. The last passage is undoubtedly suspicious, since it is decidedly out of place in accordance with the order of the sections in the book. Moreover, the second, third, and fourth constitute one Haftara. We have thus only three certain readings, namely, xl. 1 ; li. 9 ; and lxi. 10. On the other hand we see that all authorities, including the Pesiktas, enumerate the following series:—xl. 1 ; xlix. 14 ; liv. 11 ; li. 12, in which succession the position of the last passage only seems strange. The following three are named by all, though the order is indefinite, some arranging them : lxi. 1, liv. 1, and lx. 1 ; others, lxi. 1, lx. 1, liv. 1. No notice is here taken of the actual placing of these portions in the prophet book itself. The Pesikta Rabbati has Zach. ii. 14 instead of liv. 1, and has also a new Haftara in Zach. ix. 9. We can easily discover the cause of this deviation. According to the Midrash the expressions of comfort should be repeated, which is not the case with liv. 1 (*רני עקרה*), but is with Zach. ii.

14 (גִּילֵי מְאָד) ; even so is it with Zach. ix. 9<sup>1</sup> (רְנִי וְשָׁמָחַי), the emphatic מְאָד being equal to a repetition. By counting all of which we have indication there are nine, which must be divided among three years.

The probabilities are in favour of placing those first which contain the word נְחָם, so that xl. 1, li. 12, and liv. 11 would belong to the first year ; xlix. 14, lx. 1, and lxi. 10 to the second ; and liv. 1, Zach. ii. 14, and ix. 9 to the third. We have also found portions borrowed from Isaiah read after the New Year. Both Pesiktas, Maimonides, and the Persian ritual name Hosea xiv. 2, which corresponds to the import of שְׁבַת הַשׁוֹבֶה. On the other hand, the Yemenian MSS. and Solomon b. Nathan name Isaiah lv. 6 instead. We must notice here also the Haftaras cited by those authorities who know of no consolation portions, since they assigned Ezek. xviii. to Deut. xxxii., there being between these a similarity of subject-matter. The Haftara, Ezek. xviii., we found in the MS. of the triennial cycle assigned to Levit. v. which fell on Sabbath Shuba. This is the Haftara mentioned by the MS., which otherwise follows the Karaite portions, and also the South Italian ritual, whilst the Spanish, on account of the Pentateuch Seder being a song, selected 2 Sam. xxii. We have thus again three prophet readings for one Sabbath, which correspond to the three years of the cycle. When in later times there were found nine comfort portions and three Haftaras for שְׁבַת שׁוֹבֶה, all of which were retained in the annual cycle, their number offered many difficulties, for the three consolation passages in ancient times were well assigned to the three Sabbaths from the 9th of Ab till the last Sabbath of Ab, on which occasion the reading of the Law came to an end. In accordance, however, with the annual cycle, there were twelve portions for only eight Sabbaths. This superabundance of Haftaras must have given rise to

---

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps originally chosen in place of xlix. 14, which verse does not contain any comforting message.

much divergence of opinion. Just as the author in the Persian ritual sought to explain the gradually-developed series as a result of a surplus, we can similarly justify the treatment of this super-abundance by Jacob b. Yehudah, the writer of the *עץ חיים*. He says (p. 44):—

המיימון כח בלאם ניצבים שוש אשיש . וילך שבת שבין ר"ה  
 ליום כפור שובה ישראל האזינו דרשו ויש מפטירין שוש אשיש  
 אחר יום הכהורים מפני שמחת כפרת עונות והוא שחווא ננד  
 זמן שמחה שהיא כוכות . ושובה קודם ראש השנה שיכרוב  
 התקעו שופר ודרשו בין ראש השנה ליום כפור דבר' בהמצאו  
 ואימתי בהמצאו בין ר"ה ליום כפור וכשיש רק שרוי שכבות  
 מניחין דרשו שהרי נאמרת בזום גדליה ויש מפטירין שובה  
 לעולם אחר יום הכהורים דיפה השובה בין קודם גור דין בין  
 לאחר גור דין ועשה אשיש לפני ר"ה :

We can at least gather with certainty from our investigation of the consolation Haftaras, that in Palestine—probably at first in post-Talmudical times—several Sabbaths after the 9th of Ab, were supplied with passages from Isaiah, which formed the texts for homilies containing words of hope and encouragement. With the spread of this custom it was determined not only to read from Isaiah on these seven Sabbaths, but that this same prophet should be generally used as the Haftara book, and that the other prophetical works should only be resorted to, when no appropriate passage is to be found in Isaiah. Certainly, if the Haftaras for three years were to be taken from one book, it is impossible that the context should always have been the motive prompting the selection of the prophet passage. Hence it happened that readings were chosen which agree only with the initial words of the Pentateuch Sedarim, and which we found contained in the MS. treated in detail above. This proceeding was, however, only followed in Palestine, while the Babylonians remained true to the Haftaras of earlier centuries. The Babylonians were also apprised of the practice of reading the Haftaras exclusively from Isaiah.

הדורות הראשונות כשהיו קורין בתרודה—  
בשבת במנחה היו מפטירין בישועה הנביא וכלו בנחמות שם  
ר' המכרייע (§ 31; cp. Rappoport, *Erech Millin*, p. 171<sup>a</sup>).<sup>1</sup> The Karaites who came to Palestine about the middle of the eighth century found these Haftaras in vogue in synagogues of that place and adopted them without any modification.

Natronai Gaon indeed affirms that it was the afternoon Haftaras that were selected from Isaiah, so that we cannot deduce from this statement that the Babylonians had any knowledge of the fact that the morning portions were also exclusively taken from this prophet. Since, however, we see clearly that the majority of the Haftaras were derived from Isaiah, and that this book unless by means of repetition afforded no room for a second series of readings, the Gaon could only have spoken of those Haftaras already mentioned in our MS. What is meant by the custom of reading Haftaras on Sabbath afternoon, and what shape these readings assumed, must be left over for the treatment of the reading of the Hagiographa in a triennial cycle. To this subject I hope to devote a further essay.

---

<sup>1</sup> The statement that the Palestinians did not read more than ten verses must have been deduced by the Gaon from the fact that the consolation chapters xl.-lxvi. contained only 525 verses, and these being divided among fifty-two Sabbaths, give ten for each. The *Midrash Tanchuma* to Deuteronomy i. seems to have considered also the first part of the book as including consolatory passages, an opinion shared by tradition in general. We saw, however, no passage given before xl. 1, that cited at the end of xxxv. 1 being very doubtful.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.